





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

18
B.

47

THE

BRITISH CRITIC,

QUARTERLY

THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

AND

Ecclesiastical Record.

VOLUME I.

LONDON:

322773
36.
2.

PRINTED FOR C. & J. RIVINGTON,
ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD, AND WATERLOO-PLACE, PALL-MALL;
AND
J. MAWMAN, 39, LUDGATE-STREET;
AND SOLD BY BELL AND BRADFUTE, EDINBURGH; AND
R. MILLIKEN, DUBLIN.

1827.

BRITISH CRITIC
OF LITERATURE
THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME I

LONDON

LONDON:
PRINTED BY C. ROWORTH, BELL YARD,
TEMPLE BAR.

CONTENTS

OF

N^o. I.

	PAGE
ART. I. First Report of the Commissioners of Education in Ireland.	1
II. A Geographical and Historical Description of Ancient Italy, with a Map, and a Plan of Rome. By the Rev. J. A. Cramer, M.A. late Student of Christ Church.	25
III. A Treatise on the Evidence of the Scripture Miracles. By John Penrosê, M.A.	60
IV. An Historical View of the Plea of Tradition, as maintained in the Church of Rome, &c. &c. By George Miller, D.D. &c. &c.	92
V. 1. A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Derby, at the Visitations at Derby and Chesterfield, June 22 and 23, 1825 ; and published at their request. By the Rev. S. Butler, D.D. F.R.S. &c. &c. Archdeacon of Derby, and Head Master of Shrewsbury School.	
2. A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Derby, at the Visitations at Derby and Chesterfield, June 15 and 16, 1826 ; and published at their request. By the Rev. S. Butler, D.D. F.R.S. &c. Archdeacon of Derby, and Head Master of Shrewsbury School.	94

ART.	PAGE
VI. Boast not thyself of to-morrow : a Sermon, preached at Middle Claydon Church, at the Funeral of General Sir Harry Calvert, Bart. G.C.B. and Lieutenant-Governor of Chelsea Hospital, who died at Claydon House, Bucks, after an illness of eight hours, Sept. 4, 1826. By the Rev. Henry Blunt, A.M. Vicar of Clare Suffolk ; Curate of Chelsea, Middlesex ; alternate Evening Preacher at the Philanthropic Society ; and late Fellow of Pembroke College, Cambridge	99
VII. A Popular Introduction to the Study of the Holy Scriptures, for the Use of English Readers. By William Carpenter.	101
VIII. Two Sermons, preached at Guildford, in the Archdeaconry of Stoke, in the County of Surrey, at the Spring and Autumn Visitations, 1825 ; the latter before the Honourable and Venerable T. De Gray, M.A. Archdeacon of Surrey. By Charles Jerram, M.A. With an Appendix, on the Subject of Baptismal Regeneration.	110
IX. The History of the Inquisition of Spain, from the time of its establishment to the reign of Ferdinand VII., composed from the Original Documents of the Archives of the Supreme Council, and from those of Subordinate Tribunals of the Holy Office. Abridged and Translated from the Original Works of D. Jean Antoine Llorente, formerly Secretary of the Inquisition, Chancellor of the University of Toledo, Knight of the Order of Charles III., &c.	119
X. 1. Précis du Système Hiéroglyphique des anciens Egyptiens, ou Recherches sur les élémens premiers de cette écriture sacrée, sur les diverses combinaisons, et sur les rapports de ce système avec les autres méthodes graphiques Egyptiennes. Par M. Champollion le Jeune.	

ART.	PAGE
2. Lettres à M. le Duc de Blacas d'Aulps, Pair de France, &c. relatives au Musée royal Egyptien de Turin. Par le même. Première Lettre—Monuments Historiques.	
3. Deuxième Lettre.	141
XI. A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of London, at the Visitation in July, 1826. By William, Lord Bishop of London.	162
XII. Observations on Clerical Funds; a Letter addressed to the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Chester. By the Rev. William Hale Hale, M.A. his Lordship's Domestic Chaplain, and Preacher at the Charter House.	171
XIII. 1. The Tendency of Prevalent Opinions about Knowledge, considered. A Sermon, preached before the University of Cambridge, on Commencement Sunday, July 2d, 1826. By the Rev. Hugh James Rose, M.A. of Trinity College, and Vicar of Horsham, Sussex.	
2. Prospectus of the London University.	175
XIV. Pastoral Watchfulness and Zeal; particularly in Personal Instruction and Admonition. Recommended in two Sermons preached at the Bishop's Visitation at Abingdon, August 21, 1826, and August 30, 1814. By the Rev. Edward Berens, M.A. Vicar of Shoreham, Berks.	211
XV. The Office of the Christian Teacher, considered: in a Sermon preached August 23, 1826, in St. Giles's Church, Reading, at the Primary Visitation of the Lord Bishop of Salisbury; and printed at the request of his Lordship and the Clergy. By the Rev. H. H. Milman, Vicar of St. Mary, Reading.	213
XVI. Thoughts on the Erection of a Chapel of Ease in the parish of Whitwick, addressed to the Inhabitants of that parish, and particularly to those of the Townships of Thringstone and Swannington. By the Rev. Francis Mere- wether, M.A. Vicar of the Parish	215

ART.	PAGE
XVII. 1. A Farewell Sermon, preached in the Parish Church of Hodnet, in the County of Salop, April 20, 1823. By the Rev. Reginald Heber, D.D. Bishop of Calcutta.	
2. The Omnipresence of God.—A Sermon preached Aug. 5, 1825, on the Consecration of the Church of Secrole, near Benares. By Reginald, Lord Bishop of Calcutta.	
3. The Blessedness of the faithful and wise Steward—A Funeral Sermon, preached in St. John's Church, Trinchinopoly, April 9, 1826, on the Decease of the Right Rev. Reginald, Lord Bishop of Calcutta. By the Rev. Thomas Robinson, M.A. Domestic Chaplain to his Lordship.	
4. A Sermon, preached in the Cathedral Church of St. John, in Calcutta, on Sunday, April 23, 1826, on occasion of the Death of the Right Rev. Reginald, Lord Bishop of Calcutta. By the Rev. Daniel Corrie, LL.B. Archdeacon of Calcutta.	219
<hr/>	
State of the Dioceses in England and Wales.	250
Proceedings of the Universities.—Oxford.	264
Cambridge	269
Dublin	274
List of Foreign Theological Publications	279

CONTENTS

OF

Nº. II.



	PAGE
ART. I. 1. Scholia in Sophoclis Tragœdias Septem. E Codice MS. Laurentiano descriptis Petrus Elmsley, S.T.P. Oxonii e Typographeo Clarendoniano.	
2. Sophoclis Tragœdiæ Septem, ad optimorum Exemplarium fidem, ac præcipue Codicis vetustissimi Florentini emendatæ, cum Annotatione tantum non integra Brunckii et Schæferi, et aliorum selecta. Accedunt deperditarum Tragœdiarum Fragmenta.	281
II. The Life of John Sharpe, D.D. Lord Archbishop of York, to which are added, select Original, and Copies of Original Papers, in Three Appendixes, collected from his Diary, Letters, and several other authentic Testimonies, by his Son, Thomas Sharpe, D.D. Archdeacon of Northumberland, Prebendary of York, Durham, and Southwell: Rector of Rothbury. Edited by Thomas Newcome, Rector of Shenley, Herts; and Vicar of Tottenham, Middlesex.	321
III. Critical Essays on Genesis, Ch. xx., and on St. Matthew, Ch. ii. 17, 18., with Notes. By the Rev. Charles Forster, B.D. Chancellor of Ardfert, and Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Limerick.	340

ART.	PAGE
IV. Cæsar and God ; a Sermon preached in the Parish Church of St. Martin, in Leicester, on Thursday, Sept. 21, 1826, before the Worshipful the Mayor and Corporation, previously to the Election of the Mayor for the Year ensuing. By Edward Thomas Vaughan, M.A. Vicar of St. Martin's, Leicester, and Rector of Foston, Leicestershire.	348
V. Sermons, chiefly designed to display the Connection between a sound faith and a holy Life. By the Rev. Edward Patteson, M.A. of East Sheen, Surrey ; formerly of Trinity College, Oxford.	358
VI. Reise in die Gegend zwischen Alexandrien und Paräetium, die Libysche Wüste, Siwa, Egypten, Palästina, und Syrien, in den Jahren 1820 und 1821. Von Dr. Joh. Mart. Augustin Scholz, Professor der Theologie auf der Universitat zu Bonn.	362
VII. 1. A Friendly Address to the Episcopalians of Scotland, on Baptismal Regeneration ; showing that it is the doctrine of Scripture, of the earliest and purest Christian Antiquity, and of the Reformed Episcopal Church, as expressed in its Liturgy. By the Right Reverend Alexander Jolly, one of the Bishops in Scotland.	
2. A Charge, delivered on the 14th of June, 1826, to the Clergy of the Episcopal Communion of Ross and Argyle. By the Right Reverend David Low, LL.D. their Bishop.	
3. The Office of an Evangelist and Physician of the Soul : a Sermon, preached in the Episcopal Chapel at Stirling on Wednesday October the 18th, 1826, being the Festival of St. Luke, at the Ordination of the Reverend Samuel Heed. By the Reverend B. Bailey, M.A. Domestic Chaplain to the Right Honourable Lord Torphichen, and Minister of the Episcopal Chapel at Arbroath.	374

ART.	PAGE
VIII. The History of the Reign of Henry the Eighth: comprising the Political History of the Commencement of the English Reformation. By Sharon Turner, F.S.A. & R.A.S.L.	380
IX. Origines; or Remarks on the Origin of several Empires, States, and Cities. By the Right Honourable Sir William Drummond.	399
X. 1. A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Stow, at the Visitation in May, 1826. By Henry Vincent Bayley, D.D. Archdeacon of Stow.	
2. The Principle of Ecclesiastical Order explained and enforced: a Sermon preached at a General Ordination in the Cathedral Church of Chester, on Sunday, July 9th, 1826. By the Rev. James J. Hornby, M.A. Rector of Winwick.	422
XI. The Expectations formed by the Assyrians, that a great Deliverer would appear, about the time of our Lord's Advent, demonstrated.	444
XII. Lux Renata: a Protestant's Epistle, with Notes. By the Author of Religio Clerici.	464
XIII. The Lord Mayor's Visit to Oxford, in the Month of July, 1826. Written at the desire of the Party, by the Chaplain to the Mayoralty.	473
XIV. A Sermon, preached in the Cathedral Church of Chester, on Sunday, November 5, 1826. By Edward Copleston, D.D. Dean of Chester, and Provost of Oriel College, Oxford.	482
XV. 1. Two Letters to the Right Rev. J. Milner, D.D. Bishop of Castabala, Vic. Ap. &c. Occasioned by certain Passages in his "End of Religious Controversy," By the Rev. T. H. Lowe, M.A. Vicar of Grimley, in the County of Worcester, and Chaplain to the Right Hon. Viscount Gage.	

2. A Letter to the Right Rev. John Milner, D.D. upon certain erroneous Statements, and incorrect Quotations affecting the Character of Eminent Divines of the Church of England, in a Book entitled "The End of Religious Controversy." By the Rev. John Garbett, M.A. Minister of St. George's, Birmingham. . . . 489
- XVI. A Sermon preached before the Incorporated Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts; at their Anniversary Meeting in the Parish Church of St. Mary-le-Bow, on Friday, February 15, 1827. By the Right Reverend Charles James, Lord Bishop of Chester. 493

Law Proceedings relative to the Church—Special Bonds of Resignation.	497
State of the Dioceses in England and Wales,	535
Proceedings of the Universities,	545

THE
BRITISH CRITIC,
Quarterly Theological Review,
AND
ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

JANUARY, 1827.

ART. I.—*First Report of the Commissioners of Education in Ireland.*

IT will be in the recollection of our readers that, in the year 1820, Mr. Brougham submitted to the House of Commons a bill for the extension and improvement of National Education. It cannot be supposed that he entered upon the inquiries by which that measure was preceded, with any sentiment of extraordinary partiality for the Established Church. Yet the result was so decidedly favourable to the established clergy as to induce him to entrust to them the management and direction of the system which he then deemed the best; and which, be it observed, differs in nothing essential from that which is at present pursued with so much success by the National Society for the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church, and by the Association for discountenancing Vice in Ireland. This was, certainly, a pleasing tribute to the unobtrusive worth of a body of men, whose usefulness and respectability it has been but too much the object both of Mr. Brougham and his party to decry: and we regret that his general politics prevented that hearty concurrence in his plan, on the part of the more constitutional members, which might have ensured its substantial adoption. But the church was cautious and cold. Its motto seemed to be “Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes;” while the dissenting interest, one and all, exclaimed “Et tu, Brute.” To secure the goodwill of the latter powerful body has ever been an important object with Mr. Brougham, and it is understood that he abandoned his bill from no ill-founded apprehension that, if he persevered in it, he would forfeit their confidence, if not provoke their hostility.

The respect for the church evinced on that occasion by Mr. Brougham, is very remarkably contrasted with the spirit which led to the appointment of the Education Commissioners, on whose First Report we propose to offer a few observations. It is impossible not to feel some surprise at a selection of persons, for the performance of so important a duty, by which every form of religious worship seems to be sufficiently represented, *except that of the Established Church*. We are willing to give the very respectable individuals who compose the present commission credit for being actuated by what appeared to them honest and praiseworthy motives. They have certainly been diligent in the prosecution of their inquiries, and, according to their views and principles, sincerely anxious for the promotion of the great work which they had in hand. And if a sectarian bias appears throughout to have directed their views and influenced their determinations, there is no room for wonder on the part of such as are acquainted with the acknowledged principles of the majority of them, and who know how absolutely prejudices are wont to tyrannize over rectitude of purpose and strength of understanding.

The Report contains the results of the Commissioners' inquiries respecting the several institutions at present existing in Ireland for the purpose of promoting education amongst the poor. Of these the principal are the Incorporated Society, the Association for discountenancing Vice, and the Kildare Street Institution. The first, the Incorporated Society, is that which has principally moved the wrath of the commissioners; and we shall, accordingly, in the first place, direct the reader's attention to it, and bestow upon it a degree of consideration, perhaps, disproportioned to its importance. The mode in which the inquiry was prosecuted respecting this institution strikingly illustrates the spirit by which the inquisitors were actuated, and proves, at least, how little they are chargeable with any of that weakness denominated "the charity that hopeth all things."

The Incorporated Society dates its charter from the year 1733; and owes its origin to a strong desire expressed on the part of the individuals most distinguished for rank and influence amongst the Protestants of Ireland, to be aided by government in a systematic exertion for the conversion of the natives. The following extract from a letter of Primate Boulter sufficiently expresses the views by which the dignitaries and the clergy of the church of Ireland were actuated at the period when government thought fit so far to comply with their solicitations:—

"The great numbers of Papists in this kingdom, and the obstinacy with which they adhere to their own religion, occasions our trying what may be done with their children to bring them over to our church; and

the good success the corporation established in Scotland for the instruction of the ignorant and barbarous part of that nation has met with, encourages us to hope, if we were incorporated for that purpose here, that we might likewise have some success in our attempts to teach the children of the Papists the English tongue and the principles of the Christian religion; and several gentlemen here have promised subscriptions for maintaining schools for that purpose, if we were once formed into a corporate body. This has set the principal nobility, gentry, and clergy here on presenting an address to his Majesty to erect such persons as he pleases into a corporation here for that purpose, which we have sent over by the Lord Lieutenant, to be laid before his Majesty. The copy of this address I have here sent your lordship, in which you will in some measure see the melancholy state of religion in this kingdom; and I do in my own name and that of the rest of my brethren beg the favour of your lordship to give it your countenance. I can assure you the Papists are here so numerous, that it highly concerns us, in point of interest as well as out of concern for the salvation of these poor creatures, who are our fellow subjects, to try all possible means to bring them and theirs over to the knowledge of the true religion; and one of the most likely methods we can think of is, if possible, instructing and converting the young generation; for instead of converting those that are adult, we are daily losing many of our meaner people, who go off to Popery."

Thus was this institution founded, at a period when a parliamentary grant a good deal anticipated that active spirit of public benevolence which has, in our day, performed such wonders in the cause of charity. We were therefore prepared to hear that precisely the same degree of activity was not to be found amongst its early members, as distinguishes those institutions which have originated in the fervour of religious zeal, and are wholly maintained by voluntary contributions. There are few things more difficult than the judicious management of the concerns of a charitable institution. Men must be volunteers in the cause, and act from a spontaneous impulse, before they are fit to undertake it. Where the task of directing the measures of a society, or superintending any of its departments, is attached to some official post, and not undertaken from inclination, the deepest sense of duty is required to render such superintendence efficient; and in spite of every exertion abuses will occasionally creep in. We were prepared therefore to hear that charges existed against the Incorporated Society, to a degree that would justify a rigid and serious inquiry. Such an inquiry has taken place; and our astonishment remains at present unabated, that the commissioners, considering the spirit by which they were actuated, have not been able to establish a stronger case against an institution which they are anxious to consider as the scape-goat, by the sacrifice of which the Romanists were to be propitiated, and atonement made for

the offences of Protestant mismanagement in the conduct of national education in Ireland.

Charges against this society, of the gravest nature, are most confidently and unscrupulously preferred. Its governors are charged, by implication, with negligence; its school-masters are accused of cruelty, and its officers of corruption. Upon each of these charges we shall have occasion to say a few words. With respect to the first, the following is the statement contained in the Report:—

“ By the rules of the society, the catechists are required to report their opinions in all matters respecting each school to the society, at least once a month, and the committee of fifteen are authorized to grant a gratuity of £2 : 10s. per quarter, in addition to the usual salary, to every catechist who shall have complied with the society's regulations. Since the office of visitor has been discontinued, the only regular means of obtaining information of the condition of the schools is from these monthly communications of the catechists. The following extract from the examination of the secretary of the society, taken the 30th of October, 1824, will show how much of their duty in this respect is neglected, while at the same time we learn from the same officer, that he is not aware of an instance in which a part of the salary of a catechist has been withheld for the last 15 or 20 years.

Q. ‘ If the rules of the society were observed, is it not the fact that each catechist would monthly have reported upon his own respective school?’

A. ‘ Yes.’

Q. ‘ There are about thirty schools belonging to the society?’

A. ‘ Yes.’

Q. ‘ It would follow that about 270 monthly reports at least ought ere now to have been made; of these 270, how many have been made, as nearly as you can answer?’

A. ‘ There is a very small proportion; I cannot tell how many.’

Q. ‘ Have ten been received?’

A. ‘ From the 1st of January to the 1st of October there ought to have been nine letters from each catechist; that would be 270 letters.’

Q. ‘ How many of these 270 have you received?’

A. ‘ I declare I do not think there are 50.’

Q. ‘ Do you believe that as many as ten out of those 270 regular monthly reports have been received by you?’

A. ‘ Upon my word, I doubt it.’

Q. ‘ Can you recollect any one instance in which a catechist has made one of his monthly returns since the 1st of last January?’

A. ‘ I do not think there is.’”

Here the governors are represented as liable to the charge of very gross neglect of duty, in having omitted to animadvert upon the conduct of the catechists for not having furnished their monthly reports; and of the 270 such reports which should have been

received, parliament and the public are given to understand, that not a single one had been transmitted to the secretary. But what will parliament and the public think when they find that this representation derives all its plausibility from the omission of the concluding part of Mr. Adamson's last answer, which is not given in the Report although it is contained in the Appendix. Mr. Adamson had understood the question to refer not strictly to the monthly letters, but to the regular series of reports for which the catechists were responsible. And as no one series had been up to that period completed, Mr. Adamson felt himself justified in stating that no such series had been received. The statement of the commissioners is the more extraordinary, as, at the time of making the Report, they were actually in possession of 68 out of 70 monthly letters which had been received in the interval between January and October, in the year 1824; notwithstanding which, they felt themselves justified in representing the catechists as not having, up to that period, furnished one of their reports, the governors as having either overlooked or connived at this shameful negligence, and the secretary as guilty, in his evidence before them, of gross and scandalous prevarication!

With respect to the charges of cruelty, which have been preferred against the masters, little remains for us to say, as they have been, in every instance where it was sought to establish them by proof, specifically discredited in a court of justice. The commissioners themselves are, perhaps, by this time, aware, how very little the severity of their animadversions, in this particular, has been borne out by subsequent investigation. And if they possess the feelings of common humanity, they must lament that they were so lightly moved to wound the feelings, injure the characters, and possibly destroy the prospects of an humble and meritorious class of individuals, upon the *ex parte* statements of mischievous and idle boys, whose subsequent evidence was found to be as inconsistent as their statements were malevolent and unfounded.

In page 21 of the Report, we find the following passage:—"We have already mentioned the severe punishment of two boys at New Ross school for a similar offence;" (viz. that of preferring complaints against the masters,) "and in the examination of William Lewis will be found a statement of a severe beating which he received, for having, as was suggested, advised another boy to complain to the rector of the parish." Now, would not the reader suppose, upon reading this passage, that the statement of Lewis referred to a transaction different from the case of the two boys; that, in fact, two distinct acts of cruelty were thereby intimated? How will he be surprized then to learn, that these distinct acts are

one and the same; and that Lewis is himself one of those two boys from whose case his own is represented as distinguished!

Not only have the commissioners relied, with what we must be permitted to call a most unamiable credulity, on the unsupported statements of the boys respecting matters of fact, but they report as matter of fact what was frequently no more than conjecture or inference; conjecture always vague or malicious, and inference absurd or erroneous. This, we are bold to assert, in cases where the interests and characters of individuals and of an institution were concerned, establishes against the commissioners a stronger case of partiality and negligence than they have been able to prove in any of the instances by which they have endeavoured to support such allegations. Mr. Adamson had occasion to make an addition to his house, and for that purpose had some dealings with two or three of the Society's tradesmen. The honesty of these transactions might have been proved by his receipts; and the tradesmen, two of whom were living, and residing in Dublin, were willing, as now appears, to make oath that he paid them a fair market price for the articles with which he was furnished by them. The commissioners, however, do not think proper to examine either of them; while they give no small countenance to the calumny, that the building materials were procured by what would amount to a fraud upon the public.

We have dwelt at so much length on this part of the subject, chiefly because we consider that the statements which have been made sufficiently exemplify the spirit by which the commissioners were actuated in the course of their inquiries. Perhaps the only principle of unity by which they were held together was a strong disrelish of every thing connected with the established church. Their appointment we believe to have been a sacrifice to what is miscalled conciliation; to that disposition, so unhappily prevalent, to propitiate every species of dissent by a compromise of principle. There could be no greater error.

To our minds nothing can be clearer than the line which should be drawn between sectaries and the members of the established church. The latter alone are entitled to encouragement; to the former, a liberal toleration may be extended. When dissenters are freely indulged in separating from the national church, and worshipping God according to the dictates of their consciences, they have nothing to complain of. The established church is recognized by government as the great instrument of national instruction. It is *established* only because it is best fitted for such a purpose. To attain the temperate mean between superstition and enthusiasm, to provide for all religious wants without ministering to any fanatical extravagance, to secure the alliance

between what is rational and what is spiritual, that sound doctrine may be subservient to calm and exalted piety, and religion be fixed upon a sustained and unprecious elevation, these seem to be the great desiderata in any system of national Christianity, which aims at so embodying scriptural truths in its devotional observances as that they may become deeply and extensively and permanently influential upon the hearts and minds of those to whom they are conveyed. And a great blessing and encouragement, no doubt, it is, that a system of liturgical piety is scarcely conceivable by which these advantages could be more effectually attained than they are at present by the forms of sound words which constitute the services of our establishment. In almost every other system, either the affections are sacrificed to the cold, unenlightened abstract reason, or the reason is sacrificed to passion and enthusiasm, or the incubus of superstition broods in gloomy predominance over the whole moral and intellectual nature of its votary. But, in the services of the established church, cordial piety is so made to conspire with wholesome doctrine, that the most exalted devotion and the most sublime philosophy may be truly said to meet and kiss each other. It is no small tribute to their unrivalled excellence that, in many cases, those sects which, at their outset, were readiest to disparage them, have, when the fever of fanaticism had subsided, returned to them as from husks which might fill but could not satisfy;—practically acknowledging that they contained wholesome spiritual food, and that, in departing from them, they were but hewing out unto themselves cisterns that held no water.

Such, then, being the character of our establishment, it should be, by all fair means, upheld and cherished. It is the more entitled to countenance and support, as its great ends can only be secured by addressing the calm enlightened reason, without conciliating the prejudices or appealing to the passions. Other systems, partaking more of human imperfection, may be tolerated, as long as they do not interfere with the ends of good government, and when they clearly arise out of a fervid religious sincerity, which manifests itself by the sacrifices and privations which are necessary for their support and adoption. But no further encouragement should be given to them. The legislator should act upon the principle, that these eccentric movements in the religious world have all a tendency to rectify themselves. And, satisfied with having adopted and established that which is best, and which, alone, is calculated to subsist in permanent connection with our national institutions, he should patiently await the mellowing influence of time in allaying the bitterness of hostility; and rest satisfied, that long after the disappearance of those me-

tears which, to the inexperienced, portended its overthrow, its mild and steady effulgence will still beam from on high, and be "as the shining light that shineth more and more unto the perfect day." In truth, the one depends upon its intrinsic excellence, its deeply seated accommodation to the nature of man, and its subserviency to the purpose of educating, in the highest degree, his moral powers and capacities. The others arise out of individual character, and derive their principal support from the prevalence of some erroneous notion or fantastical prejudice which happens to be epidemic for a season. "*Opinionum commenta delet dies, naturæ judicia confirmat.*" And every degree of encouragement, beyond the limits of a liberal toleration, which the "*opinionum commenta*" in religious matters receive, has a tendency only to confirm and render fixed an evil that would otherwise have been but temporary. In other words, it has a tendency to convert an acute into a chronic disease. If we leave dissenting congregations to themselves, they will naturally expire, and those who belonged to them will again become connected with the establishment. In whatever degree we give them encouragement, in the same degree we furnish them with both the motive and the means for continuing in existence, long after the causes to which they owed their origin have ceased to be influential. Who would now think of raising a formidable party against the church, by objecting to the use of the surplice? Yet we know that such and similar causes did once give rise to schism, and have, in Ireland, given rise to a sect, which, we speak with perfect certainty, would not now continue to subsist but for the support and encouragement which it has received in the shape of a *regium donum*. We mean not, at present, to pronounce any opinion on the policy or impolicy of such a measure, but merely to use the fact to which we have adverted as an illustration of the principle for which we contend, namely, that a sect which has arisen and could only subsist upon the strength of some popular prejudice, which was, in fact, but a sort of life-renter of whatever power or influence it possessed, may, by the application of royal or parliamentary bounty, be enabled to hold possession of its errors and privileges by a lease on lives renewable for ever. It is hardly credible, that the laity of the Presbyterian persuasion can have any very violent antipathy to our services, when they are as frequent attendants upon the church as upon the conventicle. And it is hardly credible, that their clergy have any very violent objection to our doctrines, while most of them bring up their own children for the church. But the *regium donum* is a good thing, a much more substantial ground to build upon than the objection against surplices; and, as long as it continues to be given, we

may be well assured, that neither will the congregations want ministers or the ministers congregations.

But upon this subject no more at present; suffice it to say, that if we are right in the view which we have taken of the position which the Established Church should occupy when so important a subject as national education is concerned, it cannot be expected that we should approve of a commission constituted as the present is. It has the appearance of a committee formed by the joint consent of Presbyterians, Roman Catholics, and Soci-nians, to the exclusion of all who could fully or fairly represent the sentiments of the Church of England. Such are the men to whose lot it has fallen to inquire into and report upon the nature and efficacy of the various systems of education which are, at present, operative in Ireland. If the utility and advantages of our church establishment were properly understood and appreciated, this could not possibly have been the case; and, therefore, it was that we felt ourselves called upon to plead its title and to stand upon its prerogatives, that at least our voices may be raised against a sentence of sweeping condemnation, by which it is sought to be superannuated, and deprived of all efficient control in the management of a concern over which it is peculiarly called upon to preside, and over which hitherto, even in the judgment of its enemies, it has presided with advantage to the country.

Every age has its moral epidemic, against which, it would almost seem from experience, that precaution and prescription must alike prove fruitless. It arises out of the temper of the public mind, and is seemingly as much without the sphere of human regulation as the ebbing and flowing of the tide. In the time of the unhappy Charles the First, it manifested itself in religious enthusiasm. Antipathy to Popery, the most abhorrent, and a zeal for monstrous speculative dogmas, not less opposed to Holy Scripture than Popery itself, distinguished that distracted age. The reign which followed was remarkable for a most pestilent relaxation of morals. Popery revived, and infidelity became fashionable. To this succeeded what may be called the anti-religious age, when infidel opinions were more systematically arrayed against all settled and serious belief in the immortality of the soul and a state of retribution. During this period, the Humes and the Gibbons, and the Voltaires, were lords of the ascendant. Then followed the age of social regeneration and political reform, when the privileges of brutes were mistaken for the rights of man, and the tremendous explosion of the French Revolution made every government in Europe rock to its foundations. The special providence of God preserved these favoured islands from the wreck and devastation by which almost every other

country was visited; and a sense of religion began to revive, manifesting itself in projects of charity and usefulness, which proved the zeal and the benevolence, if not the wisdom, of the projectors. If we were called upon to describe the epidemic of the present age, we should say that it consists in an ungovernable propensity to promote the moral welfare of the world by means but ill calculated for accomplishing that important object. Ill considered projects of education, and wild and impracticable efforts at conversion, are now the vogue. These are, in our day, to accomplish every thing for the moral and social regeneration of man, which was formerly, in the dreams of revolutionary philosophers, anticipated from the principles of liberty and equality. And any distrust of the wisdom or efficiency of their plans is regarded, by the modern illuminés, with censure quite as unsparing, and, perhaps, if similar power existed, might be treated with a severity as tremendous, as was exhibited during the hour of their tyrannical ascendancy by the heroes of revolutionary Paris.

We are, therefore, fully sensible with what little effect, as long as the delusion lasts, our warning voice can be raised. But as the time must come, sooner or later, when more sober notions will prevail, we will even cast our bread upon the waters, and state fully and fearlessly in what we conceive the errors and the dangers to consist which are to be apprehended from the present spirit of popular politico-theology.

The error of the modern theorists consists in supposing, that education, as far as it is practicable to diffuse it through the mass of the people, implies moralization: that the great majority of those who are taught to read will make a good rather than a bad use of that privilege, and forthwith betake themselves to the reading of the holy Scriptures. Now it does not require any very profound wisdom to know, that such an opinion is unfounded; for it is not necessary to believe in the ultra-doctrine of the utter depravity of human nature, in order to be convinced that it is quite sufficiently corrupt to render the theory of these amiable enthusiasts delusive. Unfortunately for their scheme, the instincts which Providence has implanted in the inferior animals, and which enable them to distinguish poisonous from wholesome pastures, are wanting in moral and responsible creatures, whose virtue and intelligence consist in the sincerity and discrimination with which they endeavour, and are enabled, to separate moral good from moral evil, and to choose the one, while they refuse the other. In whatever degree, therefore, education is to be beneficial to them, it cannot be greater than the degree in which such sincerity exists, and such discrimination is exerted.

Thus we are compelled to believe that education may be

afforded to the lower orders without furnishing them with the means or the inducements to become virtuous and useful members of society. In the case of the eleemosynary institutions in Ireland, there are many amiable and excellent individuals at present employed in sowing the seed of which future Hunts and Paines, and Cobbets, will reap the harvest. For that degree of education which might enable them to detect and expose the pretensions of these empyrics is far beyond their reach. They are not brought up in sound principles of religious faith and moral and political duty. They are just educated sufficiently to have their vanity excited and their understandings bewildered. Their faculties are stirred up to insurrection against all those good and useful purposes which education might be expected to answer. They are taught to feel a pride in thinking for themselves; that is, in setting their own crude notions in opposition to the wisdom of the better instructed members of the community; and thus become, in the hands of some daring demagogue, the ready instruments for the accomplishment of the worst designs that could be conceived by reckless wickedness, or attempted by adventurous audacity.

In the present age, the education of the lower orders requires direction rather than encouragement. The great object of those who would be their real friends should be to endeavour to render that education conducive to their genuine welfare. To be enabled to read and write merely in order to swell the number of Mr. Cobbet's worshippers, or to acquire such a smattering of divinity as may inspire them with a contempt for the established church, we are sufficiently old-fashioned not to hail as any very great prognostics of national regeneration. And we are deeply persuaded that there are numbers at present in course of instruction, who will never be otherwise benefited by it than by being rendered less teachable and more loquacious. It becomes the legislature to look in time to this. If measures of a very decisive nature, and these too very different from any that have been as yet recommended by education-fanciers, be not taken, and that speedily, the consequences will be tremendous. The effects of the animalized intelligence, which has been for some time fermenting among the lower orders of the Irish, are becoming truly formidable. In order to be convinced of this, we have only to observe the manner in which it has already manifested itself in what is called the combination of trades—a combination which threatened to be, and, but for the calamity which befel the commercial classes, in all probability would have proved, as extensive and dangerous a conspiracy as ever was contrived against the peace and well-being of society. It would have been the most perfect realization of the fable of the members conspiring against the belly. But we merely allude to it now as one of the signs of the times; one of those symptoms

of that ruinous selfish insubordination, to which all short-sighted plans of education must necessarily give rise, until society becomes rent and divided by the operation of a principle which, instead of blending the upper and lower classes in harmonious connexion, has the effect of arraying them against each other in hostile conflict.

The reader will have collected, by this time, that, with the popular notions on the subject of education, we by no means sympathise. Little, we are persuaded, is necessary to be done in the way of encouragement; and government should not, perhaps, in any case do more than furnish the more intelligent and capable of the lower orders with facilities for carrying on their education beyond the point where they themselves might be disposed to stop, and up to which it is, at least, just as likely to be productive of evil as of good, both to themselves and to the community. We are no friends to the forcing system; but much might be done by the establishment of parochial libraries, and a well contrived system of examination. Suppose a general diocesan examination were annually held of the young persons who had most distinguished themselves at the parochial examinations; the course of study to be such as might best tend to confirm them in the soundest religious and political principles. For every such mind thus securely placed beyond the reach of moral and political contagion, and able to give a reason for the faith that was in them, many important advantages would be gained. When these go astray, every one knows that the harm they do is not confined to their own individual aberrations from the right way. They become, according to the mediocrity of their station, the leaders of parties in politics, and sects in religion. To prevent so serious an evil would, in itself, be no small good. But, to turn the activity that might be thus mischievously employed into the right channel, and render it subservient to utility and goodness, would surely be to confer a lasting benefit on the community. The sentiments and opinions of the multitude are never acquired by the individuals composing it for themselves: that would require an exercise of thought, which would be, to them, insupportably operose and irksome. No. They are imparted by those whose superior strength of will or powers of understanding give them some degree of authority. These become the influencing minds, by which the ideas and the feelings of their associates are moulded. They are the queen-bees, by whom the swarm is governed. Much, then, will depend on the use or abuse of the influence which they possess. And much, we are persuaded, might be done to guard against the one and to secure the other, by the judicious working of a system like that to which we have alluded, and which would

provide, as far as human regulation could secure it, that the persons described should be imbued with such feelings, furnished with such knowledge, and confirmed in such principles, as would inspire them with a cordial attachment to the church and state, and render them good Christians, good citizens, and good subjects. It is not often, willingly, or of malice prepense, that they deviate into improper courses: much more frequently are they drifted from their moorings by ignorance, and from not possessing the anchorage of some steady intelligible principle. If none were dissenters but those who, upon due deliberation, rejected the doctrine and discipline of our church, what a reduction would take place in the congregations of the conventicle! And if none were traitors but those who, in political matters, exercised a similar discrimination, how would the orators of Palace Yard be bereaved of admiring hearers! But active minds, with a newly-acquired appetite for knowledge, being left without proper aid and direction in the choice of their intellectual food, are only, by what has been done for them, swept and garnished for the occupancy of the first evil spirit that comes in their way. But fortify them by useful knowledge; secure them by good principles; and the tempter will not find them unprepared. They will be possessed of an antiseptic against the contagion of sedition and immorality; and will not only continue untainted themselves, but become the blessed means of moral health and political sanity to thousands.

For this purpose, we know of no other instrument of which government either can or need avail itself, than the Established Church. It is either eminently calculated to be thus useful, or it is not fit to be a church established. And, let it never be forgotten, it is in the hands of the government. They may make it what they please. In their hands it may become either the greatest blessing that could be conferred, or the greatest curse that could be inflicted upon the community. If they take care of it, it will, assuredly, take care of them. It is the palladium, upon the safe keeping of which depends the security of the constitution. And if they would enjoy the full measure of that political utility to which it may be made subservient, let them keep it in a state of perfect fitness for the discharge of its higher spiritual functions. Whenever the latter are subordinated to the former, and appointments made merely or chiefly with political views, government are not only chargeable with a species of guilt, which is well calculated to provoke God's anger, but, even humanly speaking, with a species of folly very like his who killed the hen that used to lay for him the golden eggs. No temporary advantages, which can be gained by such an act, can be a compensation for the permanent injury of which it must be productive both to the church and the

country. It would be like breaking up for fuel the machinery of a coal-mine. The obvious interest of government, therefore, thus conspiring with the security and well-being of the Church, in proportion as this is understood, it is but reasonable to suppose that it will be reverently and affectionately cherished, and well and wisely administered. And this being the case, there remains no room for doubting either its willingness to undertake, or its fitness to execute, such a general superintendence over an approved system of national education, as would answer every desirable end.

Education is, to the lower orders, very like the boon which *Æolus* conferred upon *Ulysses*, viz. a bag containing the elements of storms. As long as it remained in the safe keeping of its wise and discreet master, it enabled him to proceed in his course rejoicing; but when he fell asleep, and the sailors, in their folly, untied the silver bands that bound it, it disclosed, from its pregnant womb, tempests and hurricanes, which well nigh buried them in the deep. Even so will it be with the education of the lower orders of the Irish, if it be not safely managed and properly superintended. It is not so much the expansive power, by which they might be enabled to dilate their energies, that is wanting, as the controlling and regulating power by which these energies might be compressed and directed. At present, they are exposed to the influence of excessive and preternatural excitation. Every thing is done to stimulate, and but little to steady them. The stranger, to use a homely phrase, has been suffered to get into their heads. And, if the over-ruling Providence of God do not, in some extraordinary way, interfere to prevent it, every thing seems quietly preparing for a moral earthquake, by which society will be shaken to its centre; but which is, perhaps, the only thing that could disturb the complacency of modern education-mongers, or scatter their hallucinations.

But what is to be done for the *Sectarians*?—A strange question, truly!—As if it were not enough that they are permitted, within certain reasonable limits, to do what they please for themselves. So long as it may with truth be said that those who are not against the Church are for it, so long may they safely be thus indulged with a permission to take their own means of educating and moralizing their own members. This is the safe scriptural rule, which is sanctioned by the example of our Lord, and which, while it inculcates the wisdom, teaches also the limits of toleration. But surely those, who are thus tolerated, have no right to turn upon the state and upbraid it, because it does not choose to adopt and cherish the courses which they are pleased to prescribe for themselves. A system of education, to be entitled to public sanction and support, should partake of the spirit and conspire with the

ends of the church which is by law established. It should be studiously calculated not to give reasonable offence, to be accessible by all who might choose to avail themselves of it, and subservient to the purpose of diffusing the principles of enlightened loyalty and true religion. When these important objects are attained, all that is practicable is accomplished; and nothing more can be attempted without endangering the security of the whole system.

But, in a system of national education, intended for the benefit of Ireland, the prejudices of the Roman Catholics, it is thought, ought to be consulted. We are of opinion that nothing is gained, and that much may be lost, by a compromise of that kind. Education, to be effectual, must be sought for and valued. If it be so valued, the Roman Catholics will avail themselves of it, wherever nothing is done which could reasonably offend their feelings. This, even the experience of the commissioners is sufficient to prove. If it be not so valued, it can seldom do any good, and will only be brought into suspicion by being obtruded upon them. The value of the gift will be depreciated by the very anxiety to confer it; and those, who might otherwise have humbly solicited it as a boon, will fancy that we could not be so desirous of bestowing it on them without some sinister object.

But, once for all, we must protest against the notion, that the established church is to be regarded as an offence by any of the subjects of this realm; or that the prejudices and aversions of those who dissent from it are to have an influence upon the mind of parliament, in assigning the station in which it is entitled to be upheld in the country. If others respected its rights, as much as it has respected their scruples, there could be but little occasion to apprehend molestation or disturbance. But a permission to dissent is now of little value if not accompanied by a license to revile; and those, who ought to be thankful for the indulgence of professing their own religious peculiarities with impunity, feel themselves justified, by the lax and unprincipled liberality of the age in which we live, in making them a ground for limiting and restraining both the sphere of exertion and the freedom of action in the church which has been adopted by the state, and the maintenance of which, in the plenitude of its rights, is essential to the moral well-being of the community and the integrity of the constitution.

The commissioners have expressed a strong opinion, that the act of the 28th Henry the Eighth is still obligatory, which enjoins the clergy to keep parochial schools, for the purpose of encouraging, amongst the natives, the adoption of the English habit and language. They confess, indeed, that it has, in some respects,

become obsolete; and even Mr. Blake, we fancy, would scarcely insist that the Protestant clergy of the present day should be compelled, under the penalty of deprivation of their benefices, to teach the peasantry to tell their beads. With this opinion of the commissioners we do not quarrel; and if they were as anxious to place the church precisely in the position contemplated by that act, making all due allowance for change of time and circumstances, as they appear to be to find some sort of substitute for the duty which was then imposed, they would have done every thing upon that subject which we consider either necessary or desirable. It is clear, that the injunction to teach the English language, and promote the adoption of the English habit, contemplated the church in its political as well as its moral relation to the state. The Irish language was, at that time, the menstruum of disaffection, and as long as the Irish habit prevailed it would keep alive unkindly and irritating recollections. Accordingly the clergy were directed to use their influence, and take every proper means in their power, to remove what were then considered the most formidable obstacles to national tranquillity and improvement. By causing the disuse of comparatively barbarous, and the substitution of comparatively civilized customs, by which the feelings and habits of the people would be, in some measure, assimilated to those of their conquerors, they would be crushing the cockatrice of rebellion in the egg, and doing more for the stability of British dominion than could, at that time, be accomplished by the most splendid victory. The danger at the present day is not what it was then. The degree in which the Irish language and habit at present prevails is not such as to cause any anxiety in the mind of the most hypochondriacal alarmist. Ireland will never be separated from England, until England shall have been revolutionized. British connexion will only terminate when the British constitution is in danger. The same causes, and none other, which sap the one will dissolve the other. Therefore a wise government, which contemplated the national clergy as they were certainly contemplated in the act of Henry the Eighth, would endeavour to devise some means by which they might be as useful in preventing the spread of disaffection, as it was then attempted to make them in eradicating national antipathy. This is not to be done by merely enjoining them, in conjunction with Roman Catholics and Presbyterians, to catechise their own flocks. To suppose an act of parliament necessary for such a purpose would be to pay a very bad compliment to the established church. If the spirit of the act of Henry the Eighth is to be recognized in any injunction to be imposed upon the clergy, they must be placed in a condition for

doing all that can be done, by legitimate means, not only for mitigating barbarism and correcting immorality, but also for exercising a wholesome moral control over the disturbing forces which are insensibly operating the derangement of our civil and social system.

But it is time to descend to the “*res gestæ*” of the commissioners. The following is the account which they give of the origin and establishment of “The Association for discountenancing Vice.”

“ Association incorporated for discountenancing Vice, and promoting the Knowledge and Practice of the Christian Religion.”

“ This society originated on the 9th of October, 1792, in a meeting of three individuals, members of the Established Church, who entered into certain resolutions, in the first of which the objects of the founders were thus explained :—

“ Resolved, ‘ That the rapid progress which infidelity and immorality are making throughout the kingdom calls loudly on every individual, both of the clergy and of the laity, who has at heart the welfare of his country, or the honour of God, to exert all his powers to stem the baneful torrent. But as many may be disheartened by considering the impotence of separate attempts to discountenance vice, and to promote the cause of religion and piety, it appears to us advisable to associate for that laudable purpose.’

“ In the infancy of the society its funds were chiefly employed in the purchase of Bibles and Prayer Books, in printing religious and moral Tracts (which were circulated by the members at reduced prices), and in distributing premiums for the promotion of catechetical examinations. Their operations, however, must necessarily have been on a limited scale, as we find that the subscriptions received between 1792 and 1800 amounted only to £1,989 : 13s. 8d.

“ In the year 1800 the society was incorporated by an act of the legislature, and in the following year a grant of £300 was voted to it by parliament. Encouraged by this support, the association determined to extend the sphere of their operations. The distribution of religious works, and the premiums given at the catechetical examinations were increased, and a resolution was taken to apply a part of the augmented funds to the support of schools.

“ The Association being supported and managed by clergymen of the Established Church, the assistance afforded by it was particularly directed to the schools which, by the Acts of 28th Henry 8th, cap. 15, and of 7th William 3d, cap. 4, the clergy were bound to establish, but for the maintenance of which no funds had hitherto been provided. A circular notice was therefore issued by the Association, in which they expressed their hope that, by the continuance of parliamentary aid, they should be enabled to assist in the establishment and support of parochial schools, and they stated that they were ready to receive applications from clergymen willing to connect their schools with the Association.

“ With respect to the general character of this society, and the leading

principles on which its operations are conducted, it is necessary to observe, that though the object of its members is to promote the religious and moral instruction of all who are disposed to take the benefit of its institutions, their plan is particularly adapted to the instruction of those who belong to the Established Church. This principle was laid down in one of the original resolutions in these terms:—"That to guard against the danger of enthusiasm, it be established as a fundamental principle, that nothing be attempted contrary to the doctrine and discipline of the Established Church, or that shall lead in the smallest degree to a separation from the same."

"The aid which the Association are willing to give towards the establishment of schools is directed to two objects—building school houses, and granting salaries to teachers. Before any money is granted in aid of building, it is required that a piece of ground should be obtained on a permanent endowment, and vested in the minister and churchwardens for the use of the schools; if a permanent endowment cannot be procured, a lease of a portion of land, of the value of forty shillings per annum, must be obtained. By the terms of the deed of conveyance, the conditions of the grant are declared to be, that the minister of the parish for the time being, shall have the sole power of appointing and of removing the schoolmaster: that the master 'shall teach and instruct all such children as shall be named to him for that purpose by the written direction and permission of the said minister, in the principles and practice of reading and writing the English language, and of arithmetic, and to such of them as are members of the Established Church, the church catechism of the Established Church of England, in such mode, and according to such plan of education, and under and subject to such regulations as shall from time to time be in writing ordered by the said minister;' and that no person shall be allowed to take possession of the premises, &c. without signing a written agreement to quit on the requisition of the minister."

"The appointment of the schoolmaster is left solely to the clergyman, provided always, that he appoint a member of the Established Church. Of 249 schools now in connection with the Association, the masters of 99 hold also the situation of parish clerks; and we are informed by some of the managers of the Institution, that this union of offices is thought to be advantageous, by increasing the respectability of the individual who holds them."

From the spirit already evinced in their treatment of the Charter Schools, the reader may form some idea of the feeling with which they must have regarded a society so strictly in connexion with the Church; and therefore there needs but little to be subtracted, on the score of suspicious partiality, from any praise which they have bestowed upon it. The following statement, coming from such a quarter, is very satisfactory.

"In the course of our inspection, the schools connected with the Association appeared to us generally to be of a very orderly and highly respectable description."

That the business of education may be, and has been, carried on amongst children professing different creeds, without giving rise to any distrust or jealousy, is thus shown:—

“ We had in the course of our inspection been much struck with the state of many schools, in which the pupils paid for the instruction they received, and in which there appeared to be perfect harmony amongst children of all persuasions. These schools were carried on as objects of private speculation, and not supported either by public funds or by aid of societies. Each child was taught the religion which its parents wished it to learn; and the master, who depended for his livelihood on giving satisfaction to his employers, was content to impart as he could the instruction necessary for each. In this manner we frequently found the same master teaching the catechism of the Church of England to one child, the Roman Catholic to another, and the Presbyterian to a third, according to a mode which is well described to us by Mr. Cooke, the moderator of the Presbyterian Synod of Ulster. Although we do not mean to approve of the same master teaching different and conflicting religious doctrines, the state of these schools led us to the conclusion, that it was at least possible that both religious and general instruction might be communicated in establishments in which children of all persuasions should be taught together.”

It is instructive and interesting to observe the degree in which the Association for discountenancing Vice has succeeded in attracting the attendance of Roman Catholic children, without in the least departing from those principles which keep it in strict connexion with the Church. The following is the unsuspicious testimony of the commissioners:—

“ Though the schools established by the Association have been principally for the education of children of the Established Church, they appear to have been attended almost as numerous by Roman Catholics as by Protestants. Amongst the documents accompanying the General Report, printed by authority of the Association in the year 1820, is a list, dated November, 1819, of the schools at that time receiving their aid, and which contains a statement of the numbers on the roll of each school, distinguishing Protestants from Roman Catholics. By this list it appears that the total number on the Rolls of the 119 schools then connected with the Association, with the exception of five from which there were no returns, was 8,828, and that of this number 4,460 were returned as Protestants, and 4,368 as Roman Catholics.”

While this body appears to have made fewer professions of ultra liberality, it also appears to have better kept its faith with the public, and to have been more ingenuous and tolerant than any of those numerous societies which are at present outbidding each other in their anxiety to impart the blessings of education to the benighted population of Ireland. While the masters have been uniformly members of the Church of England, and while

the catechism of the Church of England has been publicly taught, no undue means have been resorted to in order to unsettle the faith of those professing a different creed; nor has any outcry been raised against the schools as if they were mere traps for converts. The Kildare Street Institution, which, in part, owed its origin, as the commissioners tell us, to a suspicion that the schools of the Association were of "*too Protestant*" a character to be generally available for the education of Roman Catholic children," has not been thus successful. Its managers, who pride themselves on being superior to party feelings, have endeavoured, we believe with the best intentions, to become all things to all men. But their system of compromise has been represented, by the Irish Roman Catholic priests, as adopted merely for the purposes of proselytism, and accordingly an outcry has been raised against it from one end of the country to the other, which has exceedingly agitated the public mind, and given rise to much rancorous and uncharitable feeling. It may be that, in the tumult and agitation thus produced, some converts have been made; but, on the whole, the good must be very doubtful, while the evil is certain and alarming.

The gentlemen who conduct the affairs of this society, are, we have every reason to believe, amiable, virtuous, and respectable in a very high degree; but they have, more or less, identified themselves with those who are making the most avowed and aggressive efforts against Popery, and thus become objects of peculiar suspicion and distrust to persons whose interests and prejudices alike conspire to favour the continuance of that superstition in Ireland. Nor are we sure that the best mode of combating the errors of popery consists in exciting a fever in the public mind, and, by exasperating controversy, lashing the populace into madness. It seems to us as clear as any demonstration, that in a country like Ireland, Popery, if left to itself, can co-exist alone with the ignorance and the barbarism out of which it originated; and that in proportion as the people are *properly* educated, they will break the shell within which they are inclosed, and intellectual vigour will give birth to spiritual emancipation. To aim at their conversion prematurely, would be to rip the untimely embryo from the womb, before the functions of life had been sufficiently developed to insure the continuance of its existence. And this is precisely what we apprehend must result from all such efforts as, under the influence of a zeal which is not according to knowledge, seek to superinduce upon the newly awakened and untutored faculties of the Irish peasant, truths which are repugnant to all his prejudices, and more likely to alarm by their novelty than to attract by their importance.

We must not omit to observe that the Kildare Street Society, by their extensive issues of cheap and useful books, have succeeded, to a considerable extent, in supplanting the vicious and demoralizing works which were, down to a very recent period, current amongst the lower Irish. What the society has done in this way is unmixed good, and entitled to unqualified commendation.

The system proposed by the commissioners we subjoin in their own words. It is as follows:—

“ We propose that public schools of general instruction shall be established, one at least in each benefice, in which literary instruction shall be communicated to children of all religious persuasions; that two teachers, to be appointed by the general superintending authority, (the establishment of which we shall subsequently recommend), shall be employed in each school, where the extent of attendance shall be sufficient to justify the expense; that they shall each of them be laymen, and that one of them shall be a Roman Catholic, where any considerable number of Roman Catholics are in attendance on the school; and that a Presbyterian teacher shall be provided in those schools, where the number of children belonging to that communion shall render such appointment necessary or expedient; that on two days in the week the school shall break up at an early hour, and the remainder of the day be devoted to the separate religious instruction of the Protestants, the clergyman of the Established Church attending for the purposes at once of superintendence and assistance, and the Presbyterian minister likewise, if he shall so think fit, for the children of his communion. That on two other days of the week the school rooms of general instruction shall in like manner be set apart for the Roman Catholic children, on which occasions, under the care of a Roman Catholic lay teacher, approved of as mentioned in the minute which we have given, they shall read the epistles and gospels of the week, as therein mentioned, and receive such other religious instruction as their pastors (who may attend if they think fit) shall direct. It may be right to notice, that in the Roman Catholic church there are epistles and gospels appointed, not for Sundays only, but for almost every day in the year, and they comprise altogether a large portion of the Old and New Testament.

“ If the attendance on a school should be so limited as to render both a master and usher unnecessary, the master might be permitted to take charge of the school of general instruction, and be also the religious teacher to the children of the same persuasion as himself. In such a case, however, a person of a different religion, duly qualified and properly remunerated, might attend at those periods in the week when the school is set apart for the religious instruction of children of a different persuasion from the master, and perform, under proper superintendence, the duty of religious teacher to those of his own communion; and it might be possible for the individual appointed to this duty, to take charge of the religious instruction in more schools than one in a parish or district. We suggest this arrangement, however, as one which is

possible rather than desirable; and express our opinion, that the establishment of parochial schools, sufficiently large to occupy a master and usher, is much the most eligible course.

"For the foundation and management of such schools of general instruction, as we recommend, we think that a distinct board should be appointed by government, of persons responsible for the execution of the duty committed to their charge, and who should be invested with sufficient authority to control the application and expenditure of the public money appropriated to the purposes of general education. The board should, we think, appoint inspectors, who should be enabled to examine upon oath. The schoolmasters, also, we think, should be sworn to conform to the rules laid down by the board for their guidance. It will be necessary for this board to have the entire control of all money to be applied to the maintenance of the schools under their care, from whatever sources it may be derived;—to have a legal right to the school house, either by a permanent grant, in the case of a parochial school, or by possession being transferred to them for a period not less than a year, in the case of a school belonging to a private patron receiving aid from the board. They should have the sole power also of appointing and dismissing all masters and assistants, and of admitting or rejecting all books or papers which may be read in their schools."

Our views are, we trust, already sufficiently developed to render many observations on this ill-digested proposal unnecessary. Suffice it to say, that it seeks to supersede the functions of the Established Church, and to erect a kind of authority which, if we may judge from the character of the present commission, will be a mixed mode, comprising every species of dissent which is contained under the genus Christianity. In depriving the Protestant clergyman of the right of appointing the parish schoolmaster, it deprives him of all effective superintendence over the school. And in associating with the master an usher of a different persuasion, and not appointed by himself, it establishes the very worst kind of *imperium in imperio*, and ensures the perpetuation of religious discord. The clergyman of the Established Church is put exactly upon a level with the ministers of dissenting and Roman Catholic congregations, with this difference, that the duty of superintendence, which is left optional with the latter, is made obligatory upon the former. It is thus the commissioners propose to revive into operation the spirit of the enactment of Henry the Eighth, which, as we before observed, contemplated the church in its political as well as its spiritual relation to the state, and recognized it as the only instrument of national moralization! The clergy must hide their diminished heads. They must not give offence to their dissenting brethren, by presuming, in a public school, supported by a parliamentary grant, to instruct in the national creed the children of their own communion!

This is conciliation with a vengeance! A kind of conciliation which would obliterate the peculiar feature by which a national creed should be distinguished, namely, universal, public, authoritative promulgation; and, we hesitate not to say, sacrifices the end in attempting to secure the means of national education. Never was there so perfect an exemplification of grasping at the shadow and losing the substance. One of the best fruits of education should be to inspire the people with a love and veneration for the Established Church, to lead them gradually to appreciate its worth and to imbibe its spirit. And is this to be done by tearing her from her place in the political firmament, where she ought to shine "*ut luna inter minora sidera*"? In an assembly alive to the rights of the clergy, and entertaining a just notion of the position which they should occupy, would such a proposition be, for one moment, endured? But, alas! the church is a widow. She sits alone, *sola secum queri solet*. Every one who goes by may take up his proverb against her. She has no one to meet her enemies in the gate. And hence the ribald insolence with which she is assailed, in the very seat of legislation, by those who are sworn to defend her. And hence the easy familiarity with which proposals are made for the confiscation of her revenues, and the curtailment of her legitimate authority;—as if the church were Naboth, and the state were Ahab, and the levelling members of the House of Commons were ambitious of appearing in the character of Jezabel.

The commissioners talk of the difficulty and the delicacy of the task which was imposed upon them. We must say that the difficulty has arisen, principally, from themselves. They have chosen to occupy themselves in balancing between the pretensions of hostile creeds; and, instead of proceeding directly to establish that system of national education which is wisest and best, and trusting to its intrinsic excellence for ultimate success, they have exhibited a most unstatesmanlike anxiety to accommodate their measures to existing prejudices. Accordingly, by giving satisfaction to no party, they have succeeded in proving, in the most complete manner, that compromise is not conciliation. In truth, we can discover no steady principle whatever by which they were guided in their determinations. Their system is built upon shifting sands. In order to be consistent with itself, it must not merely regard the established church with a contumelious jealousy, it must be as various as are the several complexions of dissent, and as changeful as theameleon. It would be very difficult to assign a sufficient reason why the prejudices of Roman Catholics and Presbyterians should be so far consulted as that ushers of their persuasions should be appointed in the public schools, while the Socinians, the Metho-

dists and the Quakers experience no similar indulgence. But, considering who the majority of the commissioners are, the plan which they have proposed might have been expected.

Upon our principles, how easily is the difficulty removed which they found so formidable. According to our views, government should assume the office, not of local interference, but of general superintendence. The schools to be established by public authority should be under the direction of the established clergy; and while nothing was permitted which could give reasonable ground for offence, they should be distinguished by the public instruction afforded to children professing the national religion, in the doctrine of the Established Church.

There is nothing which requires to be so resolutely guarded against as the insidious encroachments of latitudinarianism under the specious mask of toleration. Toleration, in the proper sense of the word, no doubt, all dissenters should possess. It is not less reconcileable with the wisest policy than consistent with the dictates of Christian charity. And if there were not men in the imperial parliament unprincipled enough in their hostility to our still subsisting institutions, to court the sectaries upon any terms, and to hold the language of disparagement and intimidation to the church, no dissenters could be so unreasonable as to expect more than a perfect impunity in the profession of their respective creeds, and that only so long as they maintained them at their own expense, and in a manner consistent with the safety of the church which is by law established. That the national creed should be professed and taught publicly and by authority, no man in his senses could be bold enough to deny, if he were not ignorant or fanatical in a degree that is alike dangerous and alarming. To such, the constitutional statesman should give place, no, not for a moment. And that any class of his majesty's subjects should be encouraged to hold that creed in such utter scorn as to stipulate for its banishment from public schools as the condition of their adhesion to a system of national education, only proves the extreme to which things have already gone, the degree in which liberality has proceeded to latitudinarianism, and the necessity for making, at length, a strenuous stand against any farther encroachments upon those sacred principles which have cemented, by indissoluble union, the church and state, and which, as long as they are preserved inviolate, guarantee the integrity of the constitution.

We cannot conclude without expressing the satisfaction which we feel at the measures and the conduct of the present chief secretary for Ireland. His administration has been distinguished for good sense, good temper, and sound constitutional principle. The manner in which he has used the extensive church patronage which

he possesses, is above all praise. Upon this subject we are enabled to speak with positive certainty. The individuals, promoted at his recommendation, are all of them men whose talents and piety reflect credit upon their appointments; men, too, whose modest worth never affected the distinction which awaited them, until they were addressed by the single-minded and discriminating secretary with the cheering words, "Friend, come up higher." We do not pledge ourselves to a perfect accordance with every particular measure of the right honourable gentleman's administration. But we should regret that he entertained any distrust of the motives which have actuated us in examining the Report of the education commissioners; as our confidence in his knowledge, judgment, firmness, and integrity is such as gives us complete assurance, that, while he continues at his present post, the machinations of disturbers of the public tranquillity will be vigilantly watched and promptly counteracted; and sacrilegious spoliators, under whatever garb, or with whatever professions they may appear, will be prevented from laying unholy hands on the revenues of the church of Ireland.

A Geographical and Historical Description of Ancient Italy, with a Map, and a Plan of Rome. By the Rev. J. A. Cramer, M. A., late Student of Christ Church. 2 vols. 8vo. Oxford. 1826. 1l. 10s.

THERE are persons in the world, who think it right to condemn every study, which does not produce some tangible and substantial profit: and the question, *cui bono?* is often asked with respect to any pursuit or occupation, which they do not happen themselves to be fond of. Perhaps no one is oftener called upon to answer this question than the lover of antiquities: whether his taste lead him to explore a ruin, or decypher a charter, to speculate upon the existence of Troy, or to illustrate a Pelasgic inscription, his researches are sure to be treated with indifference, if not with ridicule and contempt, by a large portion of mankind. It would not only be foolish, it would be culpable, to justify a love of antiquities, if they so intirely engross a man's mind, as to make him useless in the world and disagreeable in society. When the antiquary neglects all other branches of knowledge, and gives neither pleasure nor profit to others from his own peculiar pursuit, then we may safely say of him that he is an useless animal.

But it is unfair to go beyond this, and to pass a sweeping censure upon antiquarian learning itself. It is evidently the abuse and the excess which in this case are to be blamed: and unless it can be proved, that the study of antiquities is more likely than any other study to engross and monopolize the mind, there is great injustice in condemning it, because some antiquaries are useless beings.

To ask, what is the good of groping amidst broken bricks and stones, is quite as wise as to ask, what is the good of looking at an oiled canvass, or a block of marble; of drawing circles and triangles, or pulling flowers to pieces. In this manner every amusement of science or of taste may be turned into ridicule: and perhaps the remark made above is not far from the truth, that when one man finds fault with the pursuits of another, it is because the latter do not happen to suit his own inclination and his own fancy. There is surely no reason in the nature of things, why a man should not admire a ruined arch as much as a picture or a statue: it may be more fashionable to notice specimens of the fine arts, and antiquaries will never be so numerous as the lovers of statuary and painting: but still we may be justified in saying, that there is something in the recollection of ancient times, which is naturally pleasing to the human mind. This pleasure may be felt, and is undoubtedly felt by many, who, so far from bearing the name of antiquaries, have no taste for antiquities as a peculiar study, and would even condemn it in others: but who would not agree with Johnson, that the man is little to be envied, who does not feel his patriotism warmed on the plains of Marathon? and would not a school-boy, who reads his Homer as a task, and has cried over its perplexing difficulties, yet feel a kind of vexation and disappointment, if he were to be told that such a place as Troy never had an existence? The fact is, that the mind takes delight in retracing any thing that is past; and the reason of this appears to be, that imagination has then full play. It will be allowed, that the associations of ideas, to which antiquities give rise, may in many cases be of great practical benefit; but we venture to assert, that local and historical recollections are universally pleasing, though in a greater or less degree, even when no moral or political speculation arises in the mind.

Whoever has visited Rome in these days of universal travelling, may have seen honest English citizens, with their wives and daughters, gazing at the Forum and the Capitol, and evidently feeling some indescribable inward satisfaction, though, perhaps, before they left England they knew nothing of Rome except that it belonged to the Pope. There might seem at first to be little in common between such travellers and Marius in the ruins of Carthage: but the ideas passing in their minds at the moment are more si-

milar than we should at first think or perhaps wish. On such occasions we have the consciousness that we are standing on the same spot where some great man has stood before; whether this person was Cicero or Catiline, whether it was the best or the worst man of his day, makes no difference at the moment, it is the association of our own present thoughts with days long gone by, which gives satisfaction to the mind; and we contend, that this feeling is as natural, and therefore as much deserving to be encouraged, as any other which is entertained merely as an amusement, and as an accessory to our graver studies.

The book now before us will supply an illustration of these remarks. By some it will be left unopened, as containing nothing useful or profitable; while many will think it highly interesting and amusing. It is perfectly possible to be a good man and a good citizen without knowing the line of demarcation between Lucania and Apulia, or being able to point out the route by which Hannibal crossed the Apennines. All this we are willing to allow, but we deny that an inquiry into the geography of ancient Italy is therefore not to be encouraged. In whatever light we view the history of Italy, whether we look to its former political power or to its spiritual dominion in later times; whether we consider it as the land of patriots and heroes, or as the nurse of poetry and the arts; whether we view it in the splendor of its glory, or prostrate and debased as it is at present, there is a charm in the name of Italy, which few are philosophical enough to resist; and there is surely instruction to be drawn from its history, which no philosophy can present in more strong or lasting colours. We therefore feel, in common with all persons who are interested in such subjects, greatly indebted to Mr. Cramer for his learned and satisfactory investigation into the geography and history of ancient Italy.

The name of this gentleman is already perhaps not unknown to many of our readers. At least, we feel sure, that a *Dissertation on the Passage of Hannibal over the Alps* has given much pleasure and information to all who have read it, though they may not have known what the title-page concealed, that it was written by Mr. Cramer, in conjunction with a friend who travelled with him. We are happy to find, that he has been continuing the same line of study, and that having previously brought Hannibal to the Italian side of the Alps, he did not leave him there among the barbarous Taurini, but has enabled us to trace him in his marches and countermarches through the heart of Italy, and to read our Livy and Polybius with some chance of understanding their conflicting narratives. Mr. Cramer appears to be familiarly acquainted with the historians and geographers of

Greece and Italy, and likewise to have spared no pains in consulting the works of modern Italian antiquaries.

It is, perhaps, not generally known, that the local antiquities of Italy have been explored more in detail, and given rise to more elaborate dissertations, than those of any other country. Few districts, indeed, if any, in Europe, could promise more to repay the researches of the antiquary; and almost every town in Italy, if it has not had its literary society, has at least been explored and illustrated by the zeal of some learned native. When we look to Italy in its present state, where the civil institutions of its divided provinces seem to have damped and almost extinguished every thing great and noble, and where a taste for the fine arts alone flourishes, we should hardly expect that so much had been done to illustrate its general and particular history. And yet the vast collection of Muratori far exceeds any thing which any other country has yet produced; and the names of Maffei, Visconti, with those of several other authors, must always stand pre-eminent in the antiquarian world. We do not mean to speak in commendation of all the writers upon local antiquities which Italy has produced. The theories of many of them are so totally opposed to each other, that some of them must be pronounced fanciful and absurd; and prejudice in favour of his own country, or his own town, which the writer would call patriotism, leads him, perhaps, in many instances, to place the scene of some great event in his own neighbourhood, not because such a conjecture is borne out by facts, but because he and his friends are pleased to think that it was so. Mr. Cramer's criticisms upon the contradictory notions of these writers are generally very judicious; having been in Italy himself, he is better able to understand the descriptions of ancient authors; and an Englishman has an advantage in settling the difficulties of Italian history, because he has no national or local prejudice to warp his decisions.

The map, which accompanies the present work, is also one of the best of the kind which we have ever met with: as a companion to the ancient historians who treat of Italian affairs, it may in future supersede every other: and we cannot help commending it for avoiding, what is frequently the fault of English maps, that great darkness of shade, which being introduced with a view to designate the mountains, has the effect of making more than half the names of places illegible, or extremely difficult to be read. The English maps appear to have carried this custom to the greatest excess: and whoever has travelled in Switzerland cannot have failed to admire the *carte routiere* of Keller, which, though representing the most mountainous district in Europe, gives every other physical feature of the country distinctly, and yet makes the

variations of hill and valley perfectly apparent. In many maps, which we could name, the mountains are evidently drawn, in a great measure, by fancy, and are arranged so as to make a pleasing picture: and as an instance of defect in this way, we will refer our readers to most maps of Italy, where the promontory of Otranto, or what is called the heel of the boot, is represented as divided throughout by a continuous chain of mountains. The truth is, as Mr. Cramer's map exhibits it, that the branch of the Apennines, which strikes eastward toward this promontory, terminates long before it reaches the sea; and the greater part of the peninsula is level country, or diversified with low hills. Virgil, when he describes Æneas as crossing over from Epirus to the opposite coast, unde iter Italiani cursusque brevissimus undis, makes him say Cum procul *obscuros colles humilemque* videmus Italianam—an expression, which would not be intelligible according to most maps, but which is completely borne out by the real features of the country.

The book now before us will certainly be considered a dry work by many who sit down and read it through: and in some respects it is only a book of reference for persons who are studying the classics. This must necessarily be the case, since it is the object of the work to notice every town and river mentioned by ancient authors: and since, in many of these cases, the name is all that is preserved, or, if the site can be ascertained, there is no historical interest attached to it, many pages are taken up with a mere topographical catalogue. It is satisfactory, however, to have these points finally settled: and there are few readers, who do not feel their satisfaction increased, if they can lay their finger upon a map, and follow the series of events from place to place. It may be added, that the frequent inspection of a map is an important assistant to the memory: and many a person has put the battle of the Trebia before that of the Ticino, because his eye was not familiarized with the relative position of the two rivers.

The historian Livy ought certainly to feel himself indebted to the industry of Mr. Cramer. We do not mean, that he would feel himself much flattered by the mention which is made of him: for the censure, which was passed upon him in the Dissertation upon Hannibal's passage of the Alps, is here continued and supported by such demonstrable arguments, that it is hopeless to acquit him of great ignorance and carelessness. The more the details of history and geography are examined, the more the qualifications of Livy, for an historian (always excepting his elegant and easy style) are likely to be called in question: but there is such confusion, such inconsistencies and contradictions in his narra-

tive, if taken by itself, that the person, who will expose them, and reconcile them with more authentic details, must be considered a signal benefactor to the author. As instances of the happy result of critical discussion, we would refer the reader to p. 54, &c. of vol. i. where the battle of the Ticino is illustrated; and to p. 177, &c., where much light is thrown upon the route, by which Hannibal marched from Cisalpine Gaul into Etruria. As Mr. Cramer observes, there would be no difficulty in deciding the latter point, if we had no other account but that of Polybius. It is the narrative of Livy which it is impossible to reconcile with other historians, or with the country itself: and his mistake in placing the marshes, which annoyed Hannibal, to the south of the Apennines instead of to the north, is the more remarkable, because in travelling from Padua to Rome he went partly in the same direction: and his curiosity must have been surprisingly small, if he did not turn out of his way even once to trace the actual line which Hannibal had taken. Literature has perhaps sustained no severer loss than in the thirty-five last books of Polybius, of which we have nothing remaining but a few detached fragments. His vulgar Megalopolitan Greek, as Lord Monboddo styles it, is certainly anything but agreeable: but if a philosophical mind and careful investigation ever qualified a man for writing a history of his own times, the lost books of Polybius must have contained a treasure, which would be worth all the 145 books of Livy, if they had all come down to us. No man in those days would have made a tour in the Alps for the mere purpose of ascertaining the passage of Hannibal, if he had not felt the full necessity of accuracy, even in the minute points of history: and we fully agree with Mr. Cramer, that wherever the accounts of Polybius and Livy are at variance, it is much the safest course, in the absence of any other testimony, always to adhere to Polybius.

We must now call the attention of our readers to a portion of the work before us, which involves much deeper points of consideration than the manœuvres of contending armies, or the situation of an ancient town. Mr. Cramer's Dissertations are historical as well as geographical: and those persons, who see nothing in a catalogue of towns and rivers but a dry matter of reference, will perhaps take more interest in the question of the early colonization of Italy. This is undoubtedly the most interesting portion of the work, though perhaps the topographical investigations require more labour and patience of research. We do not agree with Mr. Cramer in some of his conclusions: nor indeed have we met with any theory upon this subject which is altogether satisfactory: but so many facts are brought together in the course of the two

volumes, and there is so much judicious reflection upon the opinions which have been advanced, that we cannot resist entering at some length into this interesting and obscure subject.

When considering the quarter from whence Italy was peopled, we are necessarily led into the more extended inquiry as to the different tribes which have successively peopled Europe. Upon this subject we have met with no system which seems more plausible, and more borne out by existing documents, than that which antiquaries of later years have generally adopted, that Europe has been peopled by three great streams from the East, the Celts, the Goths, or Teutones, and the Sarmatians, who followed each other in the order in which they are here mentioned. The Celts undoubtedly occupied France and Spain at the earliest periods of which we have any accounts: and we, therefore, are obliged to believe that no other tribes entered Europe before them. They appear to have travelled westward, or to have been driven on in that direction by succeeding hordes, till they reached the sea and could go no farther. The Gothic, Teutonic, or German tribes, still continue to occupy the central regions of Europe, and from the causes, just mentioned, they have not materially changed their quarters since the time of Tacitus. Having pushed the Celts across the Rhine, they followed them no farther. The country to the west was already occupied: and with the exception of a few attempts to settle in Gaul, which made no lasting impression, they appear to have sent off their exuberant population in a northern direction. The Sarmatian, or Slavonic tribes, were evidently later than the Celts or Goths in Europe; and Bohemia and Moravia, where the language is still spoken, may mark the farthest extent, to which they travelled toward the west.

This threefold migration, in the order of succession here observed, will sufficiently account for the peopling of Spain, France, Germany, and the north and east of Europe. It is notorious that dialects of the Celtic were spoken in Spain, Gaul, and the British isles; and that the nations to the east of the Rhine spoke a different language, which was called German or Teutonic. When we look, however, at the two eastern peninsulas of Europe, Italy and Greece, the theory just mentioned does not appear, at first sight, so obvious or so satisfactory. The languages of Italy and Greece cannot be said, in their bases, to be either Celtic or Teutonic. That the Latin and the *Æolic* have a close resemblance to each other, needs no demonstration; but when we compare them with the dialects of the west of Europe, they appear in some respects to stand alone: and if affinity of language is to be our guide, we must trace the colonization of these two countries from some other quarter than from the Celtic or Teutonic tribes.

The Slavonic nations being the last which entered Europe, are evidently excluded from having furnished the first settlers in Italy or Greece.

Among the French antiquaries Freret and Pelloutier, and among the Italians Bardelli and Durandi, have written learnedly to prove, that the first people of Italy were Celts. Cluverius, Maffei, and Mazzochi, are not disposed to agree with this hypothesis, and Mr. Cramer evidently does not, on the whole, believe in it. We are rather surprised to meet with expressions in his book, which would seem to confound the Celts with the Teutones; whereas, notwithstanding some coincidences in manners and rites, they are clearly of a different origin. Their languages are radically dissimilar; the marked peculiarity of their hair and eyes, which Tacitus observed, might alone serve to distinguish them: and the relative position of the two people, as well as the history of their wars, shew, as was observed above, that the Celts preceded the Teutones in forming a settlement in Europe. Upon the whole we can see no reason to give up the theory which we have long entertained, that Italy was first peopled by Celtic tribes. If what has been said of the Celts being the first settlers in Europe be true, we should naturally expect that they were also the first to enter Italy. The Germans may have followed them into that country, but the Celts would have led the way: and there are perhaps strong reasons to induce us to believe that this was actually the case. In the first place, the notion was not without supporters in ancient times. Solinus and Servius both preserve traditions, that the Umbri were of the same race with the ancient Gauls. (vol. i. p. 252.) It has often been observed, that the names of mountains and rivers in Italy, particularly in the northern parts, are of Celtic derivation: and the widely extended term *Apennine* is evidently connected with *Pen*, a head or eminence.

One of the most important means for deciding questions of this nature is found in the analogy of languages; but it is a subject which, at the same time, is involved in great difficulties, and frequently leads to fanciful and unfounded hypotheses. If we say that the first inhabitants of Italy were Celts, we should certainly be called upon to shew that the language spoken in Italy bore an affinity to the Celtic. Mr. Cramer and other antiquaries dwell much upon the fact of the small resemblance which the Celtic has either to the Latin or the ancient Etruscan; and hence they conclude, that the theory of the Celtic colonization of Italy cannot be maintained. But if the Celts who first entered Italy were followed by settlers of a totally different race, and if these, as we shall shew presently, were more advanced in civiliza-

tion than the people whom they already found there, it is highly probable that the language, which was the result of this intermixture, would partake more of the latter colonists, and retain but little of the ruder Celtic. That this is not mere conjecture may be proved by a reference to our own country. Of all the heterogeneous elements which compose modern English, it is notorious, that a very small proportion of words are British or Welsh; and yet how erroneously would Cluverius or Mr. Cramer conclude from this, that England was not first peopled by Celts? Now we imagine that the very same effect was produced in Italy which happened here. The Romans conquered the Britons, and the Latin language was diffused over great part of the island: when the Romanized Britons became too weak to resist their Saxon invaders, the language was remoulded into a German cast; and when the Normans got possession of the throne, though, numerically, they were but few, yet, from being more polished and having the government in their hands, they infused a great portion of French into the language; and, without taking notice of the Celtic or the Latin, it may be said, that the genius of the language is essentially German, with the addition of a large vocabulary of Norman terms. So uncertain and delusive a science is etymology; and so difficult is it to trace the first settlers in any country by observing its language at any given period. Still, however, a considerable resemblance has been pointed out between the Latin and Celtic languages;* greater, perhaps, than what Mr. Cramer is aware of; and it may be observed, that in many instances where the Latin terms have no affinity with the Greek, they bear a close resemblance to the Celtic. This we conceive to be an important fact; and when Mr. Cramer says, "that as the Greek language in its most ancient form appears to enter largely not only into the composition of the Latin language, but also into that of the other Italian dialects, the first settlers of Italy and those of Greece were of the same race," we cannot allow his conclusion. A resemblance between Greek and Latin no more proves that the *first settlers* of the two countries were of the same race, than the resemblance between French and English would prove, that the Normans were the first settlers or first invaders of Britain.

Our theory then is this: we conceive, that Italy was first peopled by land and from the north by a tribe of Celts; that these settlers, as their numbers multiplied, extended their journeyings toward the south; and that at a very early period another nation, of a totally different origin and language, came from the east by sea, and formed settlements on various parts of the coast.

* See the Classical Journal, vol. iii. p. 121.

This maritime people we conceive to be the Pelasgi; and we cannot express our approbation too strongly of Mr. Cramer's ingenious conjecture that the Pelasgi and the Tyrrheni were the same. This remark, which clears up so many difficulties, has been almost totally disregarded by modern writers; though some of the ancient historians, as noticed by Mr. Cramer, had evidently heard the notion discussed. Every circumstance which we read of the Tyrrheni and the Pelasgi coincides; they are spoken of as occupying the same districts; they had each the same migratory habits, and the same fondness for piratical excursions; and what one writer says of the Pelasgi as settling in Italy, another mentions in almost the same terms, calling them Tyrrheni. We thus get rid at once of the improbable story of the Tyrrhenians being a body of Lydians who sailed for Italy; though the basis of the fable may have more truth than Mr. Cramer seems willing to allow: and if the Pelasgi came from the east, as all history and tradition makes them to have done, it is very possible, that a body of them, who had once inhabited Lydia, moved afterwards into Italy.

The question as to the date of the first Pelasgic or Tyrrhenian migration into Italy is a very difficult one. We have said, that we conceive the Celts to be the first people who entered Italy, and that the Pelasgic settlements on the coast were of a later date. We do not, however, mean to adhere rigorously to this precedence. We think it probable, that this was the case: but we hear of the Pelasgi in Greece at a very early period: and if the Chronicle of Eusebius may be depended upon, which makes the Pelasgic kingdom of Sicyon to have been established A. C. 2089, it is possible, that in some of their maritime expeditions they may have visited Italy not long after the Celts had arrived there, or even before. What we wish to assert is, that the great mass of the Italian population in early times was Celtic, and that the Pelasgi and the Celts were of a totally different origin.

One of the most interesting speculations, but at the same time the most difficult, connected with the history of man, is that which concerns the origin of nations and the diversity of languages. We do not mean to enter into the discussion, whether the confusion of tongues at Babel is to be understood of the creation of certain new languages, or whether the differences which now exist have grown up in the lapse of ages, and been the gradual effect of separation. Arguments might not be wanting to lead us to the former notion. It is true, that the differences between the Celtic dialects and those of China might be caused by different hordes going off in an easterly and a westerly direction, and never having any intercourse afterwards: but when we

find such a striking difference between the languages of the Celtic and Teutonic nations, the latter of whom followed close upon the former, without any other people intervening, the same theory does not appear adequate to explain the fact. We might be prepared, however, for great dissimilarity of language between the Celtic and the Pelasgi, if we imagine, as seems to be the case, that the former entered Europe by passing to the north of the Euxine, while the latter went by the south of it. If this were so, many ages would roll away before the two tribes, originally of the same family, came again into contact; and it is not improbable to suppose, that this meeting would first be brought about in Italy.

Without pretending to settle minute details, we may conclude, that the confusion of tongues took place somewhere in the plains watered by the Euphrates. It was here that the great hive of mankind was gathered together: and it was from hence, as from a common centre, that they sent out swarms in various directions. It was generally imagined, that the Celts were the same people who were more anciently called Cimmerians, and that they were descended from Gomer, the son of Japheth. There is certainly some resemblance in the name; and it is not undeserving of remark, that the Cimmerii mentioned by Homer (*Od.* *Æ.* 14.) are supposed by some commentators to have been seated on the western coast of Italy. This we do not believe to be correct; but it is unquestionable that Homer understood by the Cimmerii a people who inhabited the western part of Europe. These Gomerians, Cimmerians, or Celts, we imagine to have left the plains of Shinar, in a northerly direction. Uncivilized tribes, whose only occupation is to provide themselves with food, would not be likely to cross any large river, till their increasing numbers compelled them to seek for room: still less would they have the desire or the means to venture across any portion of the sea: but if we inspect a map, it will appear less difficult for them to have crossed the Straits of Caffa, or Cimmerian Bosphorus, than to have surmounted the successive obstacles which met them to the north. That the Cimmerians did cross these straits, we have undeniable evidence: the *Cimmerian Bosphorus* and *Cimmerian Chersonese* attest the fact, and to this day the name of *Crimea* preserves a trace of its ancient inhabitants. Herodotus informs us, that the Cimmerians were the original inhabitants of what was afterwards called Scythia: (which confirms, by the way, the relative order of migration of the Celtic and Scythian or German tribes:) and in this direction we may suppose that they penetrated farther and farther into Europe, till they finally reached the ocean in Gaul and Spain. There is no evidence that any Celtic tribes ever settled in Greece, and the physical features of Europe will

explain the reason. These roaming hordes, who were only travelling in search of a fertile country, would not be tempted to cross the Danube, which, for several hundred miles from its mouth, is broad and rapid; or if they did, the Thracian mountains would deter them from penetrating farther to the south. Thus the Celtic tribes would never have descended into Greece; and having arrived at the top of the Adriatic, they would gradually pass through the defiles of the Julian Alps, and by the valley of the Adige into Italy. We again refer our readers to a map of Europe, and it will appear highly probable, that a stream of people, flowing from the east, would enter Italy from the north, without having descended into Greece.

That Italy was first peopled from the north-east, rather than from the north-west, seems probable *a priori*, though we cannot bring much evidence to prove that it was so. Mr. Cramer, however, who thinks (erroneously in our opinion,) that Italy was peopled from Greece, brings these settlers along the shores of Epirus and Illyrium, and so by the head of the Adriatic into Italy. He probably saw reason to conclude, that the first inhabitants, from whatever quarter they came, entered the peninsula in that direction; and in this respect we perfectly agree with him, though we believe, as stated above, that this migration from the north-east was not of Grecian, but of Celtic tribes. When the Celts, who were gradually advancing westward, became entangled in the Alpine regions of Switzerland, some straggling members of their body would naturally explore the defiles of the mountains, and thus descend into the plains of Lombardy by the numerous passes which now form the communication between the two countries. Here also we are happy to find Mr. Cramer agreeing with us; and in speaking of the Sicani, Siculi, and Ligures, who came from the west, he deduces them all from a Celtic stock. This is granting nearly all that we desire. He thinks, indeed, that the Umbri were the most ancient inhabitants, and these he does not suppose to have been a race of Celts. We think it probable that they were; and in assigning the relative antiquity of the colonists from the north-east, and those from the north-west, we should be disposed not to make any great difference between them. If the Sicani were settled in Sicily, as Thucydides asserts, before the Siculi, we must naturally conclude that they entered Italy before them, and that the former were gradually pushed southward by the latter. Thucydides indeed adds, that the Sicani came from Iberia, having being driven out thence by the Ligures; and in this he is generally supposed to mean, that the Sicani came from Spain. This retrograde movement, at such an early period, would certainly be a perplexing phenomenon: but,

perhaps, in assuming Iberia to mean Spain, the geographers have decided hastily. In the little intercourse which there was between Greece and the west of Europe, it is probable that great inaccuracy would exist as to the names of places, and the roving tribes would themselves give the same name to the different countries which they successively occupied. Thus we know that Italy in early times was called Hesperia, till a more western country than this was discovered, and the name of Hesperia was transferred to Spain. So also Iberia, the name by which the Greeks in later times undoubtedly designated Spain, may have been applied in earlier ages to a country much more to the east, or indeed to many countries; and it was not till they arrived at the ocean, and could proceed no farther, that the name acquired a fixed and settled application. Be this as it may, it seems probable that the Sicani, Ligures, and Siculi, entered Italy in the order here mentioned; that they were Celtic tribes, who came from the north or north-west, and that they gradually descended through the whole of Italy, and the first and last of them passed over into Sicily.

We may mention by the way that the different names of barbarous tribes are very likely to mislead geographers. Many persons seem to imagine, and Mr. Cramer is not altogether free from this notion, that when we read of Umbri, Siculi, Sicani, &c. these people must be actually different nations, and must have come from different quarters. This we conceive to be a mistaken assumption. In the first place, when migratory hordes are *in transitu*, and taking possession of a new country, they would hardly have any name at all; they would not want to speak of themselves collectively; and they must come into contact with some other nation, before they would be distinguished by a particular name. We may imagine, however, when any portion of them became stationary, as they would in a mountainous country, that the inhabitants of one valley might speak of their neighbours under some collective title: and thus, when the Celts entered Italy, by different defiles of the Alps, they would carry with them different names; and if they continued distinct, the name would continue also. But it is obvious that in such cases a diversity of name is not the smallest proof of a diversity of origin; nor have we any more reason to conclude that the Umbri, Sicani, and Siculi, were a different people, than that the Brigantes, Silures, and Ordovices, who inhabited different parts of Britain, were distinct in their origin. We may add that the same name might be borne successively by different tribes; and that the name might in fact be imposed upon the country rather than upon the people: thus, for instance, the people who lived at the top of the Gulf of Ge-

noa, were called *Ligures*: but if the first tribes who bore this name passed on toward the south, the neighbours, who were either not aware of the change, or not interested in it, might still apply the same term *Ligures* to the next occupiers of the same district; and this may account for the confusion made in names of countries by the Grecian geographers. We repeat, however, that the existence of a diversity of appellation is no proof that the occupiers of Italy were not all of one common stock. This conclusion could only be drawn from a diversity of language: national features, under certain circumstances, are not an unsafe test; but since we cannot pretend to tell at the present day whether the *Umbri* and the *Siculi* were similar or dissimilar in the colour of their hair, and the contour of their nose or chin, we can only judge of them by their language; and Mr. Cramer's own work will supply the proof, that there was no radical difference in any of the dialects of ancient Italy. At least we have met with only one exception to this fact, and that perhaps is misrepresented by Mr. Cramer. He is undoubtedly right in observing, that the *Veneti* were the last people who penetrated into Italy by that frontier; (vol. i. p. 112.) but he quotes Polybius as saying, that the *Veneti* differed in language from the Gauls, whence he concludes that they came from a different stock. The expression of Polybius is, γλώττη ἀλλοία χρώμενοι (ii. 17.), which perhaps may not mark a greater difference than what we know to exist between the dialects of the Celtic in Wales and Scotland; and we may remember, that Polybius was comparing the language of the *Veneti* with that of the Gauls who then lived in Lombardy, and whose ancestors had probably poured into Europe many centuries before the recent colony of the *Veneti*. Polybius himself says, that they resembled the Gauls in dress and manner; and Strabo gives it as his own opinion, that they were Gauls. We therefore see no reason for mistrusting the conclusion to which we came above, that Italy was first peopled by Celtic tribes from the north.

As to which of the numerous people were entitled to be called *Aborigines*, we confess that it appears to us an unimportant question. Some modern writers have discussed it with as much earnestness, as if they had been anxious to make out the claim of the ancient Athenians, and to prove that some one tribe had sprung out of the earth, or descended from the clouds. When we speak of the *Aborigines* of Italy, we of course mean the people who first inhabited it; and when Mr. Cramer says that the *Umbri* appear to him to have the best claim to the title of its aboriginal inhabitants, (vol. i. p. 14.) we are not disposed to differ from him; but at the same time, from the mountainous nature of its northern frontier, it is probable that the first settlers came in

many and nearly simultaneous bodies, and that several hordes would be united, before a political power of any importance would be established.

We must now proceed to consider whether any settlements were formed in Italy by people of a totally different origin from the Celts. Mr. Cramer is evidently of opinion, as we have stated already, that the first inhabitants came from the east; by which he means, that they were of the same race with the people who first settled in Greece. With this position we cannot agree. We conceive that two nations, from totally different stocks, formed the earliest settlements in Italy, the Celts and the Pelasgi. Having given our opinion concerning the Celtic migrations, we may now discuss those of the Pelasgi. We must again call the attention of the reader to the ingenious hypothesis of Mr. Cramer, that the Tyrrheni and Pelasgi are to be considered the same. Ancient writers have preserved accounts of very early settlements being made in Italy by people under both of these names; and we repeat that we do not pretend to settle the question, whether the Celts from the north, or the Tyrrheni from the east, were the first to set foot in Italy. We are rather inclined, however, to give precedence to the former. Antiquaries have endeavoured to trace the Pelasgi from Peleg, the descendant of Shem, in the same manner as they have deduced the Celts or Cimmerians from Gomer the son of Japheth. However this may be, there is certainly evidence to show, that the Pelasgi reached Europe by the south coast of the Euxine, passing through Asia Minor. They are stated from the first to have been of a wandering turn, and to have been addicted to expeditions by sea. That this latter circumstance should exist in the Pelasgic, rather than in the Celtic tribes, will appear extremely probable, if we consider the directions in which the two families proceeded. The Celts, as soon as they were got to the west of the Euxine, would never have a sight of the sea till they reached the western extremity of Europe; but if we suppose the descendants of Peleg to have left the plain of Shinar at the same time with the children of Gomer, they would naturally reach the coasts of the Mediterranean in a third of the time which would be necessary to bring the Gomerians to the coast of the Atlantic. Here the same cause, which led the Gomerians to extend themselves progressively in a western direction, would oblige the Pelasgi to betake themselves to the sea. Their numbers were increasing, and they were arrived at the end of their continent; they had therefore nothing to do but to spread themselves along the coast of Asia Minor, and to send off colonies by sea. The narrow straits of the Hellespont would not be difficult to cross, even without the aid of ships; and several of the islands of the *Ægean*

were within sight of the shore. Accordingly we find that Lemnos and Imbros were colonized by the Pelasgi in very early times; and Diodorus Siculus tells us, that the ancient name of Lesbos was Pelasgia. Hence they seem to have sent out expeditions for colonization or piracy into various countries of Greece. Part of Thessaly was called Pelasgia, and the Pelasgic wall of Athens is well known to the classical reader. We may suppose the Pelasgic settlements in Thessaly to have been previous to the Trojan war, because Homer recognizes the name; but he also mentions the Pelasgi as a separate people, who lived in the neighbourhood of Caria, which confirms what was said above, that the Pelasgi, in their journey westward, traversed Asia Minor. It seems not improbable that the ancient inhabitants of Caria were themselves Pelasgi: at least we know from Thucydides, that the Carians had a naval force in the earliest periods of Grecian history, and Minos is said to have collected a navy which defeated them.

We should be inclined to ascribe the maritime expeditions of the Pelasgi to a very remote period of antiquity. Perhaps many of the stories, which the early poets preserved of the fabulous ages before the records of authentic history began, may be traced to these wandering voyages of the Pelasgi. If any of them returned back to the quarter from whence they set out, they would naturally recount the wonders which they had seen; and it is not unnatural, that these wonders should be exaggerated. The poets also would not neglect such valuable supplies; and without adhering to unities of time and place, they might bring together the stories which were related by many different parties, and work them into an entertaining whole. The Argonautic expedition may have been one of these poetical romances; the basis of which was a scattered collection of truths cemented together by the imagination of the compiler. This curious fable had evidently many variations; or, as we should say now, it went through many editions. At first, it was confined to a voyage from Thessaly to Colchos on the Euxine: and we may observe by the way, that Thessaly is known to have been the first and principal settlement of the Pelasgi in Greece. Succeeding poets appear to have vied with each other in their marvellous additions to this voyage; and the best way of accounting for the extraordinary route, by which the Argonauts were made to return to their country, is to suppose, that the wonders of different travellers were also woven together without any regard to the connexion or probability of events. According to some, the ship Argo was carried over land and launched at the top of the Adriatic; and such a story is so wild and extravagant, that it could only have been added with a view to introduce the adventures of some persons, who had returned from Italy soon after the discovery of the country.

It has been a frequent attempt of commentators to settle the geographical descriptions given by Homer; and among other disputes it has been questioned, whether Ulysses is represented as visiting Italy. Mr. Cramer is evidently inclined not to attach much credit to the critics, who have identified the names of places in the *Odyssey* with certain parts of Italy. But he surely goes too far, when he hints that Homer describes places which never had an actual existence. We would rather imagine, as observed above, that in common with his brother poets he led his hero an imaginary voyage, but introduced into his narrative the accounts which he had actually received from different travellers. It does not follow, that Homer himself had any definite notion of the situation or relative distances of the places which he names: as far as he was able he probably adhered to truth: but his main object was to make Ulysses meet with all the perils and dangers, and to visit all the strange places, of which he had received any account. It is useless, therefore, to attempt to reconcile all his statements; and we will undertake to say, that it never can be done. Thus, when Homer mentions the *Cimmerii*, it is very possible that he had no notion of their geographical position; but it can hardly be doubted, that he had heard of such people somewhere: and it seems almost certain, that they were not in Italy. For when he first mentions them, he says (*A.* 13.) that they were *near to the ocean*: and shortly after he makes such an evident distinction between the ocean and the sea (*M.* 1, 2.) that according to Homer they should rather be placed in Spain. The Pillars of Hercules or Straits of Gibraltar were undoubtedly known in Homer's days, though perhaps only to a few: and such a long voyage would naturally be embellished with many marvellous adventures.

Whether we are to understand Sicily by the country of the Cyclops, is a more difficult question. It is most probable, that we should be right in doing so, because all later writers placed the Cyclops in that country. Homer, however, seems only to have heard of the people, and to have known nothing of their relative situation. He at least makes use of no description, which might not apply to any other country as well as Sicily. All that we have to guide us is, that from the *Malean promontory* to the land of the *Lotophagi*, was a voyage of nine days, during which time the wind was blowing a gale; and from the *Lotophagi* to the Cyclops was apparently a short distance. There can be no question but that the Cyclops, according to Homer's notion of them, were a barbarous people. They, at least, could have no affinity with any Grecian stock, and they appear evidently to have occupied their country before any ships touched there from Greece or Asia. We conceive them to have been the Celtic

Aborigines. Homer expressly says that they had no ships, which would be rather singular, if we believe them to be islanders: but the fact is in accordance with what we know of Celtic customs. Their country was extremely fertile, and corn and vines are mentioned among its productions. The people lived in caves on the tops of high hills: and in Sir R. C. Hoare's account of Sicily there is the following passage:—"The singularity of the valley consists in the traces it displays of the habitations of a numerous people, whose era, and even whose very existence, has escaped the attention of history. These dwellings form different stories, excavated in the rocks on each side the valley; some at so considerable a height as to be accessible only by ladders, or by a connexion with the lower story."—(p. 66.) This furnishes a close illustration of Homer's expression,

'Αλλ' οἷγ' ὑψηλῶν ὀρέων ναίουσι κάρηνα,
'Εν σπέσσι γλαφύροισι . . . (I. 113.)

and inclines us to think that the people whom Homer calls Cyclops, lived in Sicily. It seems that Telemus, the son of Eurymus, had visited them before Ulysses, (I. 509): and though the voyage of Ulysses was a fable, we may safely believe that Telemus was a real character, who had actually visited the country; and Homer may have taken this opportunity of introducing the name of one of his own friends into his poem. In another place (A. 106), he mentions the island Trinacria; but there is nothing to show the identity of that country with what he had before named as the land of the Cyclops. But it is time that we should leave Homer's Sinbad, and return to the Pelasgi or Tyrrheni.

We have said that they appear to have visited Italy in very early times: and we should be inclined to think that they went invariably by sea. Freret would wish to prove that they reached Italy by land; but Mr. Cramer well observes, that they "were unquestionably a maritime people; and their first settlements Hadria, Spina, and Ravenna, were seaport towns." Few events in history are more remarkable than the rapid progress which the Tyrrheni made in Italy; and nothing shows more forcibly the advantage which civilization possesses over numbers and more ancient possession. The Umbri and Siculi appear to have been the most powerful of the Celtic inhabitants: and we copy the following passage from Mr. Cramer's work, which excellently describes the manner in which a few Pelasgic adventurers successively spread themselves over the fairest part of Italy.

"They gradually advanced from the Po, into the country of the Umbri, who, being then at war with the Siculi, gladly received their assistance, and after the expulsion of the enemy, gave them settlements and lands in the newly-acquired territory, which was Etruria Proper. In

the history of these events I adhere chiefly to the authority of Philistus, the Sicilian historian, who makes the Siculi of Ligurian origin ; and states that the people who expelled them were the Umbri and the Pelasgi, that being the most rational and intelligible account of this very early revolution. According to the same historian, the migration of the Siculi took place about eighty years before the siege of Troy, which agrees nearly with the date assigned to the same event by Hellanicus, so that we shall not be very far from the mark in assigning the date of about one hundred years before the Trojan war, to the settlement of the Tyrrheni Pelasgi in Etruria. Here, then, they founded, with the assistance of the natives, their first twelve cities ; and if we conceive this people bringing with them all the improvements in war, navigation, and general civilization, which Greece was then beginning to derive from her proximity to the East and to Egypt, into a country only inhabited, and that partially, by rude and savage clans, we shall easily form an idea of the great and rapid influence which they would exercise over the moral and political state of Italy. We must suppose them to have been joined, from time to time, by numerous bands of Pelasgi, adventurers like themselves, as Ephorus represented them, who would flock from different parts of Greece to any country where renown and profit were to be acquired. The Tyrrhenian pirates, who had hitherto infested the *Ægean*, would naturally retire, when that sea was protected by the navy of Minos, to the seas of Italy, to exercise there the habits which they had acquired from the Phœnicians, and which remained so long a characteristic of their nation. We learn from Strabo, that the Greeks did not venture to send colonies into Sicily till long after the fall of Troy, owing to the dread inspired by those formidable depredators. From the tradition preserved by Lycophron, it would appear that they formed settlements on almost every part of the coast washed by the Tyrrhenian sea. Their colonies in Campania and in Lucania, where Pæstum is supposed to have been first founded by them, as well as others on the shores of the Adriatic, also sufficiently attest their busy and enterprising spirit. They seem in fact to have spread themselves over all Italy, and in that sense we may perhaps take the assertion of Livy to be true, that the Tuscan name had reached every part of the peninsula and its seas before the arrival of *Æneas*. But it was in Etruria, properly so called, that the Tyrrheni laid the first foundation of this power, and established under Tarchon their leader, a confederacy of twelve cities."—(Vol. i. p. 163, &c.)

The whole of this extract so entirely agrees with our own theory as to the population of Italy, that we wonder Mr. Cramer should not more decidedly have drawn the conclusion, that its first inhabitants were Celts. The resemblance which the Etruscan and Latin languages bear to the Greek, would not at all lead us to agree with Mr. Cramer in thinking that the first inhabitants were of a Grecian stock. We have already said, that a civilized people will always impress its language upon one which is more barbarous, if the two become blended together : and there is a fact mentioned by Pliny and Victorinus, which we believe is not

alluded to in Mr. Cramer's book; this is, that the Pelasgi, under the guidance of Hercules, introduced letters into Latium. Whoever we are to suppose this Hercules to have been, we have here an acknowledged tradition that letters were introduced by the Pelasgi; and every one who has investigated the subject must have observed that the Latin language resembles the *Æolic* more than any other Grecian dialect; and the *Æolic* is known to be the oldest form of the Greek language. It may be added that the ancient Etruscans wrote from right to left, and the old Pelasgic inscriptions are also written in the same way. These facts may be brought to prove that the inhabitants of Italy learned much from the Greeks: but we repeat that the whole course of ancient history leads us to conclude, that the first and original settlers were of a totally different stock.

When it is said that the Pelasgi carried letters into Italy, this must not be understood of the first comers; for there is every reason to think that the Pelasgi themselves learned the use of letters from the Phœnicians: and Cadmus, who had the honour of importing this improvement into Greece, did not arrive there till regular settlements had been made in many parts of the country. It must, therefore, have been sometime subsequent to Cadmus, that the use of letters was carried into Italy. The Phœnicians themselves may perhaps have visited the Italian coasts in ancient times: and some of the early traces of civilization, which we meet in that country, may have been owing to Phœnician rather than to Pelasgic arrivals. The Egyptians may also have contributed their share in introducing some improvements. Diodorus Siculus has observed, that Egypt sent many colonies into different parts: and, according to Eusebius, a distinct work was written upon this subject by Ister, an inhabitant of Alexandria. But of these Egyptian colonies little or nothing is known. History has preserved the names of Cecrops, Erichonius, Danaus, and others, who undoubtedly went from that country into Greece: and it is the opinion of Shuckford, that they arrived there long before the time of Moses, when Egypt was suffering great tyranny and oppression from the new dynasty of shepherd kings. He supposes that it was this oppression which caused so many persons to quit their country about the same time and seek for settlements in foreign parts; and if large numbers migrated, it is not improbable that some of them might settle in Italy. But upon this, as observed above, neither history nor tradition have preserved any details. The fact is certainly not improbable, and we should rejoice if Mr. Cramer could throw any light upon so obscure a subject.

We have seen that the Tuscan power grew up by the union of

the Tyrrheni with the Umbri, or whoever else were the first inhabitants of the central parts of Italy. The Greeks, as might be expected, continued to speak of this powerful people under the name of Tyrrheni; but the Romans, from some cause with which we are not acquainted, spoke of them under the appellation of Etrusci or Tusci. The history of the Tuscans, if we had materials from which it might be composed, would be extremely interesting. It would carry us back into times long antecedent to the reputed foundation of Rome, and would exhibit to us that ancient people, powerful by land and sea, with the arts and sciences flourishing among them. We should find them decidedly the leading power in the west of Europe, and constantly coming into contact with the formidable navy of Carthage. Mr. Cramer in a few words describes the decline and ruin of their political consequence.

“Had the Tuscans formed a regular and effective plan for securing their conquests and strengthening their confederacies, they would have been the masters of Italy, and perhaps of the world, instead of the Romans. But their enterprises, after a certain period, seem to have been desultory, and their measures ill combined and ineffectual. A fatal want of internal union which prevailed amongst their states, as Strabo judiciously observes, rendered them an easy conquest to their Gallic invaders in the north of Italy, and to the hardy Samnites in Campania; while Rome was aiming at the very centre of their power and existence those persevering and systematic attacks, which with her were never known to fail. The history of the Tuscans, subsequently to the foundation of Rome, is to be gleaned from Livy, and at intervals from short detached notices in the Greek historians and poets: but a rich field is left open to the antiquary, who would illustrate the annals of this interesting people from the monuments that are daily discovered in their country, which seems destined to be the seat of the arts and of good taste through a perpetuity of ages.”—(Vol. i. p. 169, 170.)

The early history of Rome is involved in still greater obscurity than that of the Tuscans. The Roman antiquaries themselves disputed as to the date of its foundation, and nothing certain was agreed among them. But this is a minor point, compared with the questions which have been agitated in modern times. It has always been thought doubtful whether much authority should be attached to the history of Rome, previous to the burning of the city by the Gauls, when, as Livy himself tells us, all the records were destroyed. But some later writers have endeavoured to convince us, that the whole of the early Roman history is altogether a fable. Upon the subject of this historical scepticism, Mr. Cramer has some very judicious remarks at vol. i. p. 347.

“Let us retrench, if it must be so, the gaudy decorations and fanciful ornaments with which these historians have embellished their work,

but let us not at the same time overthrow the whole fabric. We may prune what is exuberant or decayed, and weed what is rank and unprofitable; but we must beware, in the process, of encroaching upon what is sound, or rooting out what is wholesome and nutritious. Let it be granted that the rape of the Sabine women is a fiction, it may still be true that Tatius and his Curetes were once masters of Rome. Though it be uncertain with respect to the Horatii and Curiatii, which belonged to Rome, and which to Alba, we may still believe that the latter city sank beneath its more powerful rival. The elder Tarquin's reign does not cease to be an historical fact, because we hear an absurd story of an eagle uncovering his head on his arrival at the gates of Rome. The constitution, said to have been framed by Servius Tullius, may have been the result of longer experience and more practical wisdom than falls to the lot of a single reign: but it was such a constitution as Rome did receive, and which it was afterwards enabled to bring to a state of greater perfection than any ancient form of government that we are acquainted with. Suppose the story of Lucretia false, we cannot deny that monarchy was established at Rome, and made way for consular authority about the time that Livy pretends, though that historian may be wrong in giving Valerius Publicola, and not Horatius Barbatus, as a colleague to Brutus. The valour of Horatius Cocles, and the fortitude of Mutius Scævola, may be left to the admiration of school boys; but the siege of Rome by Porsenna is no idle tale invented for their amusement, though it should be proved that the consequences of that event were not so honourable to the Romans as Livy has chosen to represent them. It is a disputed point, whether two or five tribunes of the people were elected at first: but does that doubt invalidate the fact of the secession to the Mons Sacer? Cancel three-fourths of the Roman victories and triumphs over the Æqui and Volsci, will it be less true that the former were nearly exterminated, the latter completely subjugated? Say it was gold, and not the valour of her dictator and his troops, which delivered Rome from the Gauls; she may surely boast of having lived to revenge herself on the barbarian foe, and of having, by a hundred triumphs, blotted out the stain of that transaction, and of the shameful rout on the banks of the Allia. In short, though we may sometimes pause when reading the early annals of Rome, and hesitate what judgment to form on many of the events which they record, there are landmarks enough to prevent us from straying far from our course, and to lead us on safely to the *terra firma* of her history."

With the substance of these remarks we fully agree: that is, we think it highly probable, that most or all of these characteristic facts had a substantial basis of truth: but still, if they were preserved only in tradition, the writers who first worked them up into a connected history, might perhaps not preserve any order of dates, and might supply the connecting links entirely from their own imagination. Plutarch informs us, that Diocles of Peparethus was the first writer who gave any credit to the early history of Rome, such as it has come down to us; but of this

Diocles nothing is known. An ingenious hypothesis might perhaps be framed as to the early history of Rome being fabricated out of materials taken from Greek writings. It is certain that many incidents recorded by Herodotus are to be found in Livy and Dionysius; and this coincidence may be observed in great and important events, as well as in those which are trifling and ludicrous. Of the latter kind is the story of Sextus Tarquin cutting off the heads of the poppies, which is an evident copy of the tale related by Herodotus concerning Thrasybulus and the ears of corn. A more remarkable parallel may be found in the birth of Romulus compared with that of Cyrus. Both, it must be remembered, were founders of great empires; both were exposed in their infancy: the one was nourished by a wolf, or, as the antiquarians interpreted it, by a woman whose name was *Lupa*; and the nurse of Cyrus was Spaco, which in the Median language signified *a bitch*. The battle of the Horatii and Curiatii may remind us of what Herodotus relates of the combat between the Argians and Tegeans, though in the latter case there were 300 on each side, and only three in the former. The history of Herodotus may bring to our recollection many coincidences of this kind; some of which, particularly the resemblance between Romulus and Cyrus, appear almost too striking to have happened twice and in different countries. We may remember also that Herodotus ended his days at Thurium, in the south of Italy: and it is well observed by Tiraboschi, that when the Romans are said to have derived all their literature from Greece, we are to understand Magna Græcia, from which country the earliest Roman writers came, and in which Thurium was situated.

Admitting, however, that much of the early history of Rome is fabulous, or borrowed from the histories of other countries, much of it may also be true: and whatever hypothesis we form as to this part of the subject, there will be difficulties to encounter, which the ancient Italian writers do not enable us to surmount. Thus it seems likely to remain for ever undecided, whether Romulus was the founder of a new city, or whether the Tuscans had inhabited it long before. That such a person as Romulus existed—that he came from Alba, and occupied a strong position on some of the seven hills, is too well attested by history and tradition, to be altogether denied; but at the same time, when we recollect that the Tuscan power extended over all that part of Italy, and that Veii was within eight miles of Rome, it is highly improbable that so good a natural position, as that which was afforded by the seven hills and the river Tyber, should have been neglected by that warlike people. Mr. Cramer mentions many facts which point out a connexion between the Tuscans and the early inha-

bitants of Rome (vol. i. p. 354.); and upon the whole no supposition appears to us so plausible as that which makes Rome to have been built and occupied by the Tuscans in very early times, and afterwards to have been seized by an adventurer from Alba.

We have not time to discuss at much length the probability of an Arcadian colony having settled on the Palatine hill. Mr. Cramer justly observes, that there is a great concurrence of ancient testimony in support of such an event; but he adds, that it is not probable that Evander actually came from Arcadia, as that district could never have been a maritime country. That the Arcadians were not a maritime people in the time of the Trojan war, or at least in the time of Homer, is evident from the fact mentioned by him of the ships which led their forces to Troy having been furnished by Agamemnon, "because they took no concern in naval affairs." But we have observed above, that when a nation or a tribe were in the habit of changing their abode, the name by which they were known might be left impressed upon different districts. That the Arcadians were Pelasgians, we know, not only from Pausanias, who expressly asserts the fact, but from the more ancient testimony of Herodotus. It is perfectly possible, therefore, that a tribe of the same Pelasgi who ultimately settled in the interior of Peloponnesus, may have sailed in very early times to the western coast of Italy; and thus an Arcadian colony may have settled on the Palatine hill, though they did not come from the country which was subsequently called Arcadia, and though the Arcadians of whom Homer spoke had no acquaintance with maritime affairs.

The classical reader can scarcely fail to have observed the total silence of the early Greek writers with respect to Rome. Aristotle appears to have heard nothing concerning it, though he took such pains to become acquainted with the institutions and the history of foreign states. Herodotus might have been thought still more likely to have mentioned it, and the more so, because he ended his days in Italy. He has however not once alluded to the existence of such a city. Scylax the Geographer, who is supposed to have written about the time of Pericles, is, as Mr. Cramer observes, the earliest writer who mentions Rome. Theophrastus, Theopompus, and Clitarchus, also alluded to it, as we are told by Pliny, and they lived a little later than the time of Alexander. With these exceptions, the wars of Rome, and her gradual encroachments upon the territories of her neighbours, appear to have caused little sensation beyond the immediate confines of Italy; a fact which might perhaps be brought to prove that Rome was for some centuries in a state of greater obscurity and insignificance, than the writers of the Augustan age would

endeavour to persuade us. There is reason indeed to think that the ancients possessed some traditions of the early intercourse between Greece and Italy, which are now entirely lost. Thus Justin tells us that the Phocæans, when they had left their country in the time of Cyrus, and were making the voyage which ultimately led them to the foundation of Marseilles, sailed up the Tiber to Rome, and made a treaty with Tarquinius Priscus, who was then king. Herodotus knew nothing of this story; nor, though he mentions the flight of the Phocæans in considerable detail, does he even state that they founded Marseilles. It would be rash, however, to conclude that the tradition preserved by Justin is altogether a fable. The dates assigned by chronologists to the reigns of Cyrus and the elder Tarquin, sufficiently coincide to make this visit of the Phocæans not impossible; and if Polybius is correct in saying, that a treaty was made between Rome and Carthage in the first year after the expulsion of the kings, the name of Rome must certainly have been known at some distance beyond her own walls, and even beyond the limits of Italy.

The Greek colonies in the south of Italy, which gave the name of *Magna Græcia* to that part of the country, must be looked upon in a very different light from the Pelasgic adventurers alluded to above, though Mr. Cramer has not pointed out the distinction with sufficient plainness. The Pelasgi, who visited the coasts of Italy in early times, cannot with propriety be called Greeks. They were themselves the settlers of that country which was subsequently called *Hellas* or Greece: and though their voyages to Italy were probably made at a later period, Greece itself was in a far too unsettled state for some hundreds of years to send out colonies into distant parts. The first Pelasgi were evidently a barbarous and unlettered race; they seem to have had little notion of civil polity, or domestic comfort; and their long voyages were probably undertaken more from a restless activity, and a dislike to settled habits, than from any political or commercial spirit. The Pelasgic Greeks learned the arts and institutions of civilized life from the Phœnicians and Egyptians; and the remark of Thucydides is probably correct, that it was not till after the lapse of many years, and a long continuance of internal wars, that Greece had leisure, or indeed the means, to send out colonies. Mr. Cramer indulges himself in paying high compliments to the spirit and enterprize of the Greeks, who, though possessing such an insignificant territory themselves, yet established settlements in every part of the Mediterranean. We should perhaps be more accurate in ascribing the earliest Greek colonies to the natural consequences of an increasing population. Confined in many instances to a narrow space between mountains and the sea,

and almost compelled to keep within the walls of a fortified town, they were obliged to send out colonies which might find a maintenance for themselves in some other country. And thus the numerous states of Magna Græcia gradually grew up into independent and flourishing republics.

Thucydides observes, that Italy and Sicily received their colonies for the most part from the Peloponnesus; and such we might naturally expect to have been the case. The local situation of Athens would direct their sailors to go eastward, and visit the coasts of Asia Minor; nor would they be often tempted to double the stormy promontory of Malea, and venture into the open sea to the south. The Peloponnesian states, on the other hand, and particularly Corinth, which had a harbour on the west side of the isthmus, would naturally send out their ships in that direction, which, after following for some way the line of the Epirot coast, would pass over, with little risk, to the opposite and neighbouring shores of Italy. Accordingly we are told by Mr. Cramer, that the Achæans "were the first to establish themselves on the eastern coast of southern Italy:" and the towns of Sybaris, Crotona, Metapontum, and Caulon, which were followed by Tarentum, Locri, and Rhegium, were founded precisely in the situations in which we should expect to find them.

The first settlements of this kind made by the Achæans may be supposed to have taken place about the year 720 A. C.; and though the new comers may not have been aware of the fact, they were probably descended from the same stock with some of the tribes in whose neighbourhood they settled. All writers appear to argue, that the Ænотri were the most ancient inhabitants of southern Italy; at least that they were the people who occupied the country when the Achæans first arrived there: and Italus, who had the honour of giving a name to the whole peninsula, is reported to have been a chieftain of the Ænотri. Mr. Cramer takes some pains to show, in opposition to Dionysius of Halicarnassus, that the Ænотri were not the aborigines of the country, nor descended from an Arcadian colony. We repeat what we have said above, that the first Celtic inhabitants and the Pelasgic adventurers who afterwards settled amongst them, probably became so intermixed, that it is hopeless to attempt to distinguish them; and the confusion, which prevailed upon this subject among ancient writers, probably arose from their not being aware that in some districts the Celtic population was most numerous, while in others the Pelasgi had gained the ascendancy; besides which, they appear not to have remarked, that the Pelasgi came to Italy from many different quarters, and at many successive periods.

When we reflect upon the opulence and prosperity to which some states of Magna Græcia attained, it must excite surprise, that so few architectural remains have survived to attest their ancient grandeur. There is, perhaps, no other country which was once so famous, and now presents so few interesting tokens to the traveller and the antiquary. The situation of many of the towns is still a subject of dispute. Some of them are known to have been in ruins in the time of Pausanias and Strabo; and, with the exception of Tarentum and Rhegium, scarcely any have retained their ancient name or even their former site. The temples of Pæstum are almost the only ruins which attract the notice of the traveller in that once interesting country; and they may be said to owe their preservation rather to the insalubrity and sterility of the neighbourhood, which has not caused any modern town to make use of the materials. Mr. Cramer says, in a note, "It is singular that no ancient writer has alluded to the temples of Pæstum, the most striking edifices unquestionably which have survived the dilapidations of time and the barbarians in Italy." We cannot, however, see any thing remarkable in this silence. It is probable, that almost every town in southern Italy possessed temples and other public buildings of equal or even greater beauty; for the style of the remains at Pæstum is of a character which, though bespeaking a very remote antiquity, is certainly inferior in elegance and in chasteness of design to many other edifices which still survive. The fact, therefore, of their not being mentioned by ancient writers is not at all more singular, than that the most celebrated statues, which have come down to us, the Apollo Belvidere, the Venus de' Medici, the Farnese Hercules, &c. &c. are not mentioned by Pliny, or any other writer, who has treated of the works of art. The reason perhaps, in both cases, is the same; that the Greeks or Romans would have said, in the words of King Henry,

"I trust I have within my realm
Five hundred as good as he."

The most singular circumstance concerning Pæstum is the total demolition of all the houses, and the level appearance of the soil which must once have been covered with buildings. It is a matter of authentic history, that Pæstum was finally destroyed by the Saracens in the year 915; and there is a tradition that the cathedral of Salerno received some architectural ornaments from this ill-fated city. But what is become of the remainder of the ruins? No other town, as observed above, has sprung up in its neighbourhood; there is a church and one or two houses within the walls; but, with these exceptions, there is nothing but the walls themselves, the three temples, and an amphitheatre, which

indicates the situation of an ancient town. The surface also is not particularly uneven nor strewed with fragments. The guides, it is true, will stamp upon the ground, and inform the traveller that it is hollow underneath; but if we may judge from the steps which lead up to the temples, the soil has not accumulated above the ancient surface to any remarkable degree. The same perplexity concerning the site of deserted towns presents itself in other places. The Campagna of Rome was once nearly covered with houses for many miles from the walls: excavations often bring to light some of the foundations: but the natural process of vegetation appears to remove the traces of the encroachments made upon it by man, with a rapidity of which we have no idea in our own country, where, fortunately, the ruin and abandonment of a town has not become a common occurrence.

We have a word or two to add concerning the roses of Pæstum. Every poet, every traveller, and almost every reader can quote passages which prove, as he imagines, that

“ ——— twice each year her storied roses blew.”

Mr. Cramer has collected nearly all these passages: but the only one which can support the idea of the roses blowing twice a year is that from Virgil, who speaks of

“ ——— biferi rosaria Pæsti.”—*Georg.* iv. 119.

but these words, if we understand them rightly, only mean—the rose beds of the *fertile* Pæstum—the epithet *biferi* being applied not to the roses, but to the soil of Pæstum generally, which, as in many other parts of Italy, produced two crops in the year. This also is a circumstance attended with some difficulty. There can be little doubt that the neighbourhood of Pæstum was luxuriant and productive in ancient times; whereas the soil is now marshy and barren, and the air unwholesome. The climate of Italy has certainly undergone considerable changes; but whether they are to be ascribed to some causes, over which art has no control, or whether the spots, which are now unproductive might be reclaimed by a better system of agriculture, is a question which would lead us too far from our present subject. The following observations of Mr. Cramer are to the point, and may interest the reader.

“ It has been thought by some modern writers, that the climate and temperature of Italy have undergone some change during the lapse of ages; that the neighbourhood of Rome, for instance, was colder than it is at present. This opinion seems founded on some passages of Horace (*Od.* i. 9. *Epist.* i. 7, 10.) and Juvenal, (*Sat.* vi. 521.) in which mention is made of the Tiber as being frozen, and of the rest of the country as exhibiting all the severity of winter. But these are circumstances which happen as often in the present day as in the time of Horace, no

is it a very uncommon thing to see snow in the streets of Rome in March or even April. I witnessed a fall of snow there on the 12th of April, 1817. Whatever change may have taken place in some districts, is probably owing to the clearing away of great forests, or the draining of marshes, as in Lombardy, which must be allowed to be a much better cultivated and more populous country than it was in the time of the Romans. On the other hand, great portions of land now remain uncultivated, which were once productive and thickly inhabited. The Campagna di Roma, part of Tuscany, and a great portion of Calabria, are instances of the latter change."—vol. i. p. 10.

To the passages collected by Mr. Cramer concerning the celebrity of the Pæstan roses, we would add the following from Claudian, which might lead us to suppose, that this celebrity was owing to the country about Pæstum producing *double* roses.

"————— vel flore sub uno

Ceu geminæ Pæstana rosæ per jugera regnant."

In Nupt. Hon. 246.

We could have wished that Mr. Cramer had entered a little more at length into the history of those ill-fated but interesting towns, Herculaneum and Pompeii. He says indeed, with truth, that so many books have been written on the antiquities and works of art discovered in Herculaneum, that the subject need not be enlarged upon here. (vol. ii. p. 176.) And with respect to Pompeii he refers the reader to "the many excellent works which are already before the public." (p. 180.) It is not upon the modern re-appearance, or the fossil antiquities of these two cities, that we wish Mr. Cramer to have entered into a discussion: but the date of their overthrow, as well as the history of the whole of this coast, which has evidently been ravaged by volcanic action in very remote times, would furnish an interesting and entertaining topic, which the research and ingenuity of Mr. Cramer would be well qualified to illustrate. The reader would hardly understand, from his description, that Pompeii, which is now at least a mile distant from the sea, was formerly a maritime town; and the different nature of the material which has covered the two places is a fact of considerable importance, when we are investigating the period of their submersion.

Mr. Cramer observes, "of the more complete catastrophe which buried Pompeii under the ashes of Vesuvius, we have no positive account; but it is reasonably conjectured, that it was caused by the famous eruption under the reign of Titus." (vol. ii. p. 180.) This was in the year 79; and, in our own country at least, there seems to be but one opinion as to this being the period in which the two cities were destroyed. There are, however, some reasons for entertaining doubt on this head. We have now lying before us a work published at Naples, in 1816, by C. Lippi,

the title of which is, "*Fu il fuoco, o l'acqua che sotterrò Pompei ed Ercolano?*" and the object of the author is, to prove, what appears at first sight an appalling paradox, that the two cities were destroyed not by fire, but by water! The title of the book, however, might lead us to think it more absurd than it really is; and, in justice to Signor Lippi, we inform our readers, that he supposes these towns not to have been destroyed in the reign of Titus, but subsequently; and that their submersion was not caused by a volcanic shower, projected immediately from the crater, (or as he repeats it an hundred times, *non già dalla caduta delle ceneri vulcaniche, lanciate in aria del Vesuvio,*) but was the effect of long and continued rains, which brought down the volcanic matter that had been accumulating for ages on the sides of the mountain, and thus buried the town in what might literally be described as a stream of cinders. It is true, that the Academy of Sciences at Naples, of which Signor Lippi was a member, brought the question to a vote, and decided against his hypothesis by a majority of eighteen to two; and at a subsequent sitting they passed a decree, that no memorial of Signor Lippi, upon this subject, should ever again be entertained by them. Notwithstanding this very scientific mode of deciding the question, there are more grounds than might be supposed for adopting (if we may speak geologically) the Neptunian theory rather than the Plutonian. We cannot at present enter into the discussion farther than to state a fact, which is perhaps the strongest point advanced by Lippi, that in a covered cloister of the house, which stands outside of the walls of Pompeii, in the street of the tombs, a row of jars was found, some of which were filled with volcanic ashes. It might reasonably be asked, if that city was buried by a shower of burning matter descending perpendicularly upon it, how could these jars be filled when they were standing under a roof, and this roof was not destroyed? Signor Lippi argues, that they were filled by a stream of ashes which were washed into the cloister by a sudden inundation: and his reasoning seems more plausible, when we are told, that all the jars which were standing in a row were not found to contain ashes: the whole of the cloister was filled; the upper stratum was vegetable mould; beneath which was a layer of ashes; but the strata were not horizontal: and those jars only contained volcanic matter, the tops of which met the stratum of ashes: when the jars rose above this stratum they were filled only with soil, whence Signor Lippi argues, that the ashes did not descend perpendicularly, but were washed in by a stream of water. It may be added, that Sir Humphry Davy is decidedly of opinion, that the manuscripts found in Herculaneum had not been acted on by fire; and that the tufa, with

which the town is covered, "was the result of torrents laden with sand and volcanic matter, and descending at the same time with showers of ashes and stones." He tells us, also, that from the appearance of the exterior manuscripts, and the interior part of the manuscripts, they "must have been acted upon by water." Sir Humphry Davy probably held the opinion, which is confirmed by the authentic accounts of later eruptions, that water issued from the crater, together with the more solid materials; and though this is not the manner in which Lippi conceives the aqueous deposit to have been made, he may certainly appeal to the chemical experiments of Sir Humphry Davy as confirming his own theory, or, at least, not contradicting it.

We should be unwilling to conclude from these or any other arguments, whatever weight we may attach to them, that every commentator and antiquary has been wrong in assigning the destruction of *Herculaneum* and *Pompeii* to the year 79 of the Christian era. But history certainly lays some difficulties in the way of our adopting this belief. In the first place we may observe, that it is no uncommon thing to hear that the younger Pliny mentions the overthrow of these two towns in the letter which relates his uncle's death. Some of our readers may perhaps have entertained this belief. But if they will examine the letter, they will find that no mention whatever is made of *Herculaneum* or *Pompeii*. It is there stated, that showers of ashes fell at *Stabiæ*, which was at a greater distance from the mountain than *Pompeii*; and, therefore, we may infer that the latter place was visited in the same way: but not a syllable is said in this interesting letter of these two cities being buried. It may be added, that the town of *Stabiæ* has been covered to the same depth as *Herculaneum* and *Pompeii*: and since Pliny, who names this place, does not mention that the ashes had the effect of entirely overwhelming the town, we may infer, that the eruption which buried *Stabiæ* was not that in the reign of Titus, but one which happened subsequently, and which may, at the same time, have destroyed the two other towns.

Tacitus is sometimes quoted as alluding to this catastrophe, when he tells us that some cities on the fertile coast of Campania were swallowed up or overwhelmed (*haustæ aut obrutæ.*) But he appears to be there treating of an earlier period than the year 79; and his expressions are more applicable to the damage which was done to these two towns by an earthquake in the year 63. Dio Cassius is the earliest, and we believe the only writer of antiquity, who expressly says that these two towns were destroyed by the eruption in the reign of Titus. He tells us that it produced lamentable effects in many other quarters, and

“totally overwhelmed two whole cities, Herculaneum and Pompeii, while the people were sitting in the theatre.” But Dio Cassius, it must be remembered, did not flourish till about the year 230: and what he says of the inhabitants being seated in the theatre at the time of the eruption appears evidently untrue; for two theatres have been excavated in Pompeii, and one in Herculaneum, and not a single skeleton has been found in either. We can hardly indeed imagine the calamity to have come so suddenly as not to have permitted the people to escape from the theatre, which is the meaning necessary to be given to the words of Dio: and the whole appearance of the streets of Pompeii, as far as the excavations have been carried, militate against the idea of the mountain having sent forth its fiery showers without any previous notice. It is impossible to read the description given by Pliny of the consternation which was caused by the eruption of 79, and to imagine that any inhabitants of Herculaneum and Pompeii would have thought of attending an exhibition in the theatre. It seems not improbable that Dio confounded the eruption of 79 with the earthquake which happened in 63; for we learn from Tacitus, that a great part of Pompeii was thrown down in the latter year: (An. xv. 22.) and Seneca, speaking of the same earthquake, informs us that part of Herculaneum was in ruins, and what was standing was in great danger at the time of his writing. Thus much is at least certain, even from the account of Dio himself, that the two cities were not so “totally overwhelmed” as he states them to have been; for he goes on to say, that Titus immediately despatched two consular persons into Campania to repair the damage which had been done, and to establish two colonies in Herculaneum and Pompeii. We learn the same fact from Suetonius, who lived at the time, and speaks of an eruption of Vesuvius, which happened in the reign of Titus, but does not mention Herculaneum and Pompeii by name. He adds that officers were sent by Titus for the relief of Campania, and that the goods of those persons who were killed by the eruption, and who left no heirs, were applied to the restoration of the cities which had suffered. This contemporary account may be depended upon as true; from which it seems plainly to follow, that the immense deposit of volcanic matter which concealed the two towns for so many centuries, could not have been the effect of the eruption in the time of Titus. Had they then been buried to their present depth, the emperor would never have thought of digging them out. It would have been vastly cheaper to build a new town upon the new surface which had been raised: and by that strong, and sometimes infatuated attachment which binds all men to their native spot, persons are

never wanting in that populous country to construct houses upon the tops of those which have been destroyed, and to sink their foundations in lava which is scarcely yet cold.

Tertullian, who flourished A.D. 200, might also be quoted as confirming the notion of the two cities being destroyed in the reign of Titus; for in refutation of the notion that every public calamity was caused by the anger of the Gods against the Christians, he says, that fire from Vesuvius covered Pompeii at the time when there were no Christians who could be accused; which expression, though by no means true, even if we apply it to the eruption of 79, yet requires us to understand it of some early period in the Christian era; and undoubtedly the year 79 is the earliest which the accounts of any historian will allow us to assign. Tertullian, however, lived in Africa, and did not write till 130 years after the supposed event took place: neither do his words necessarily imply that the town was completely buried: (*Pompeios de suo monte perfudit ignis*. Apol. 41.) and against these authorities we may oppose a remarkable passage in Florus. This writer, as he informs us himself in his preface, lived in the reign of Trajan, and he speaks of nearly 200 years having elapsed from the time of Augustus to his own. In the sixteenth chapter of the first book he dwells at some length upon the beauties and advantages of Campania: "Here," he says, "are mountains clothed with vines, Gaurus, Falernus, Massicus, and Vesuvius the most beautiful of all, which is a rival of Ætna in its fires: cities upon the seacoast, Formiæ, Cumæ, Puteoli, Naples, Herculaneum, Pompeii, and the very chief of cities, Capua, which was formerly reckoned one of the three largest cities with Rome and Carthage." Here is an author writing several years after the reign of Titus, and he names Herculaneum and Pompeii among the most beautiful towns on the coast of Campania. It might be said, indeed, that he was speaking of these towns, not with reference to his own times, but to the period of the Samnite war, the history of which he was then writing, and which took place in the year 340 A.C. This, however, seems highly improbable; for in the first place, in the very passage now quoted, he speaks of Vesuvius as a volcano, though the Romans had no account of any eruption previous to that of 79; and having alluded to this phenomenon, he would hardly have mentioned Herculaneum and Pompeii in the next sentence as flourishing cities, if he had known that they had entirely disappeared: and in the second place we may observe that, speaking of Capua as the chief of cities, and a rival of Rome and Carthage, he expressly uses the word *formerly*; from which it is natural to infer that, though in his time Capua had lost its distinguished pre-eminence, yet that

Formiæ, Cumæ, Puteoli, Naples, Herculaneum, and Pompeii, were still inhabited towns.

We are left, therefore, to conclude, that if Herculaneum and Pompeii suffered from the eruption in the reign of Titus, which they most probably did, (particularly Herculaneum, which is situated quite at the foot of the mountain,) either a part only of the cities was destroyed, or they were not buried so deep as to render the restoration of them impracticable.

It remains to be inquired at what period the catastrophe happened, which reduced them to the state in which we at present see them? If they were not destroyed in the reign of Titus, or if they were, and the emperor caused them to be rebuilt, when did the eruption happen, which again so completely overwhelmed them? This is a question more easy to be put than to be answered. It is certain that no subsequent historian mentions any explosion of Vesuvius, which had the effect of burying Herculaneum and Pompeii: but authors have reckoned up thirty eruptions since that of 79, and some of them are stated to have been awfully violent. A very great one took place in 203; and Tigonius assures us, that in the year 472 there was such a shower of ashes projected from the mountain as to cover all Europe, and to reach even to Constantinople, which is nearly 800 miles distant! The Emperor Leo is said to have been alarmed at these unexpected visitors, and to have fled from the city in dismay!! The truth of this narrative may be questioned by persons who are not remarkable for scepticism: but those who invented such a story must have had some grounds for their exaggeration: and it is reasonable to conclude that the eruption of that year was greater than any of which the persons who saw it had any record. Some of our readers may perhaps be glad to have a list of the years in which other remarkable eruptions are stated to have happened: they were in 512, 685, 1036, 1049, 1138, 1139, 1306, 1500, 1631, 1660, 1682, 1694, 1698, 1701, 1737, 1751, 1754, 1759, 1760, 1765, 1766, 1776, 1778, 1779, 1794, with a few others which have happened recently. In some of the earlier of these eruptions the destruction of Pompeii and Herculaneum may have been completed. They may perhaps have been buried at different times: for the material, which covers Pompeii, consists of small ashes not cemented together, whereas the strata, which are cut through in the ruins of Herculaneum, are as solid and as hard as stone. If the proofs already given were not sufficient to convince us that the final catastrophe did not happen in 79, we may add, that the excavations made at Herculaneum have brought to light six strata of volcanic matter, which have evidently been deposited at successive periods.

The history of the whole of this part of the Italian coast would furnish interesting matter for discussion, if Mr. Cramer would undertake the investigation. It is sometimes stated, that the eruption in the reign of Titus is the first which is known to have taken place from Vesuvius. It may be the first of which we have any authentic details; but it was well known to the ancients that the volcano had been in action at a much more remote period. The streets of Pompeii are paved with lava; which to those who believe the destruction of the town to have taken place in 79, must be a proof that former eruptions had occurred, from which this lava had been formed. But no proofs upon this head are wanting. It is impossible to travel through Tuscany and Campania without observing volcanic matter, in beds of greater or less thickness, over nearly the whole surface of the country. The earth called Puzzolana, and the building stone called Tufo, so much used at Rome, are evidently of volcanic origin. Vitruvius has preserved a tradition of Vesuvius having exploded in ancient times; and Strabo and Diodorus Siculus both draw the same conclusion from the appearance of the mountain in their own days, i. e. in the reign of Augustus. The Forum of Vulcan, which is described by Strabo, appears, as Mr. Cramer observes, to be the extinct crater, which is now called Solfatara. Other names were given by the ancients to this part of the country, which seem clearly to point out that fires had been seen to proceed from it at different periods. The lake Avernus, the rivers Styx and Cocytus, the Phlegræan and Elysian fields, with many other scenes of classical celebrity, have all been placed in this neighbourhood; and that the descent to the infernal regions was somewhere thereabouts has been repeated by so many of the poets, that it is needless to quote the passages. Mr. Cramer doubts whether Italy contains the scene of Ulysses' descent into hell, and whether the Cimmerii, who "were covered with clouds and darkness, and who never saw the light of the sun," were understood by Homer to be situated in Italy. We have already given as our opinion, that the words of Homer, if taken in all their detail, do not seem to place the Cimmerii in Italy; but we have also hinted, that Homer probably had no definite idea as to where they were, but had only heard of such people from travellers; and since later writers certainly did place the Cimmerii on the western coast of Italy, it is not unlikely that the sailors who gave the account to Homer had been in those seas and witnessed the clouds of smoke which issued from the hills. There is every reason to think, that at some very remote period the whole country was on fire to a much greater extent than it has been within the range of authentic history. The battle of the Gods in the Phle-

græen fields, when mountains were piled upon mountains, like Pelion upon Ossa, may not unnaturally be traced to an ancient tradition of these numerous volcanos; and a Græcian or Phœnician sailor, when he returned home after having witnessed the phenomena of that tremendous coast, might be allowed to indulge himself in a little romance, and may very innocently have worked upon the imagination of the Homers of the day. Perhaps some of the miraculous events recorded by Livy and other authors may be explained by a reference to volcanic action. The showers of stones, which fell so often at Alba and in Campania, (both of them volcanic countries,) may have come from Vesuvius or other mountains. We would refer the reader particularly to Livy i. 31. & xxv. 7. in each of which places the words of the historian may easily be applied to the usual effects of an eruption. Pliny also mentions a shower having fallen in Lucania of matter resembling sponges, (ii. 57.) which could hardly be any thing else than pumice stone.

We must now take our leave of Mr. Cramer and his interesting discussions, having already trespassed too long upon the patience of our readers. We shall be happy to resume our acquaintance with him, if he continue, as we trust that he will, to carry the same spirit of research, and the same judiciousness of reflexion, into other parts of the ancient world.

ART. III.—*A Treatise on the Evidence of the Scripture Miracles.*

By John Penrose, M.A. London. Baldwin and Co. 1826.
1 vol. 8vo.

MR. PENROSE is already known to the literary world, (though not by any means so well known as he righteously deserves to be,) first, by his Bampton Lectures, which exhibit a masterly contrast between the true wisdom which has laid the imperishable foundations of Christianity, and that miserable counterfeit of wisdom which never fails to implant the elements of destruction in every work of imposture: secondly, by his "Inquiry into the Nature and Discipline of Human Motives," a performance of very high merit, but whose excellence is unhappily encased in a style of composition, penetrable only by resolute and vigorous application. He now appears again before the public, with the present *Treatise*, which fully sustains his reputation as an able and honest reasoner, and a profound and original thinker.

The plan of this *Essay* is very comprehensive. It consists of a preliminary dissertation, containing a statement of the nature

of miraculous evidence; and showing that, under certain conditions, the exertion of a power unequivocally superhuman must be held conclusive of divine authority; while the rest of the work is occupied with a detailed enumeration of the various evidences we possess for the real performance of the scripture miracles.—*See* Preface, p. xvii.

The author seems to be apprehensive lest the former part of this plan should be deemed a needless trial of his own industry and his reader's patience. For "wherefore, (he imagines it will be asked,) wherefore this proof, that in the *Scripture Miracles* we possess a certain sanction of truth? What Deist now imputes to magic, or to dæmoniack agency, the miracles which we ascribe to Moses or to Christ? Who is there who does not allow them, if performed, to prove the agent's divine authority; or who questions any thing of them, except their real performance? Why attempt to prove what is not brought into question? Why beat the air by thus solving objections which no modern incredulity is found to propose?"—Preface, p. xviii. xix.

These apprehensions, we conceive, the author may confidently dismiss. For, in the first place, it must be readily conceded to him, that the "principles discussed in the Preliminary Dissertation form to the believer a necessary part of his entire series of proof;" a part, too, the more valuable, "because the notion, that real miracles may be performed, and yet not be decisive of a divine authority, has certainly been the persuasion, if not of the present age, yet of most ages of which we have any historical record."—Preface, p. xxi. But, in the second place, we believe that the principles in question are by no means inapplicable to the state of mind of many an unsteady believer, even at this day. We apprehend that there are persons who, though they would never think of imputing to magical or dæmoniack agency the miracles of Moses or of Christ, are yet thrown into much perplexity by this consideration—that, if any created order of beings has the power of producing præternatural effects, the force of all miraculous evidence is much weakened, if not altogether destroyed. For, if Christ and Beelzebub can, each of them, alter the course of nature, how can we surrender ourselves, with confidence, to the guidance of either? It is evident, therefore, that such persons, unless relieved from this embarrassment, will find no refuge but in a total abandonment of the miraculous evidence, or in the belief, that no evil being can be entrusted by the Almighty with the privilege of working miracles; in contradiction, as we conceive, to the plain tenor of scripture.

It is well known that the latter branch of this alternative was chosen by Farmer; and to his vigour and acuteness we are

accordingly indebted for a triumphant proof, that no real miracles were wrought by the Magicians of Egypt, or by the Witch of Endor.* Unfortunately, however, he has pursued his principles to an extent which brought him into a wilderness of dangerous speculation, where his learning served only to mislead him. We hope that it will not be regarded as an unpardonable digression from our more immediate purpose, if we seize this opportunity of offering a few remarks which have suggested themselves to us, on a recent perusal of his work. We have the less hesitation in craving this indulgence of our readers, as the subject is intimately connected with the design of Mr. Penrose; and as the peculiar notions of Farmer are by no means extinct, though his work may not now be very generally read. And we shall heartily rejoice, if our observations prove in some degree corrective of the evils which appear to us inseparable from his scheme of thought relative to this very important department of theology.

The grand error then which runs through his treatise is, the presumption, that we are in a condition to judge what mode of administering the moral government of the world is, or is not, compatible with the moral perfections of the Deity. Finding himself unable to reconcile to the divine equity the permission of superhuman agency, to all appearance in behalf of falsehood, he exhausts his ingenuity and erudition in devising for himself a satisfactory mode of interpretation; a scheme which shall relieve scripture from the difficulties he attaches to the belief of any preternatural interference not proceeding *directly* from God.

Now, it may safely be allowed, that it would be an impeachment of the goodness of God, to assert, that He had let loose, on responsible and moral agents, a class of malignant beings, armed with fearful powers of delusion, and privileged to exert those powers according to their own caprice, without control or limitation. But how is his goodness impeached by the supposition, that such beings may have a limited commission, or an occasional license, to display superhuman agency before men? How can we be sure that it may not have formed part of his original design to allow such occurrences, either for the exercise of our judgment, or the trial of our faith, or for some other wise but unsearchable purpose? If to suppose the possibility of this, be to impeach the Divine Benevolence, or Justice, how can we peruse the history of mankind, or survey the state of the world, without finding a perpetual arraignment of those attributes? What shall we say to the numberless forms in which evil is allowed to enter into the mysterious texture of God's providence?

* Farmer's Dissertation on Miracles, c. iv. s. 1. 2.

and who shall confidently deny that the visible effects of malevolent spiritual agency may sometimes be among them? We all perceive that men are left very much to their own powers in seeing and feeling their way out of physical and moral difficulties; and Christians know that the honest exercise of those powers has the promise of a blessing. Why should these conditions be inapplicable to any particular class of difficulties or trials? Reasoning independently of experience, we might be tempted to pronounce that a gracious and righteous God would never suffer "a strong delusion" to go forth among his creatures, in any shape, or under any circumstances. But every day's observation confounds such reasonings and surmises. How then are we to prescribe the exact degree and kind of difficulty which is to attend the respective varieties of our probation.

In answer to all this we are repeatedly told that God can never give his sanction to imposture. But, how does it appear that any such sanction is to be implied from a license occasionally given to evil spirits to work wonders, more than from the general course of providence which has allowed so much success to human impostures of the most flagitious kind. It seems, so far as we can discover, a fixed principle of the divine government, never to lose sight of the moral probation of accountable beings. In that case every economy, whether providential or miraculous, must always be expected to propose the severest trials to our reason and our faith. And if spiritual agency is to be employed for our temptation in one way, it is difficult to see why it should not be permitted in another. If the Devil be allowed to assail us with secret suggestions, why are his emissaries to be wholly debarred from the grosser resources of delusion? Nay, more: can it be questioned that internal temptations may be incomparably more dangerous and subtle than the exhibition of lying wonders? Our suspicions are naturally armed, even against miracles, in support of questionable doctrines. But what mortal can, of himself, be a match for invisible principalities and powers, when engaged in a confederacy with flesh and blood; that is, with his own depraved and inordinate passions?

It is, indeed, maintained by Farmer, that miracles performed by lying spirits *must* be a trial too severe for all human sagacity and virtue. He allows, indeed, that the evidence of miracles is, in a certain sense, an instrument of our probation, because it must operate, more or less, according to the disposition of the individual. That it will not overcome inveterate obstinacy is manifest by the fate of the Gospel miracles. And, in every case, men must be left to the use of their moral and rational faculties, either in yielding to it, or resisting it, as a motive operating on

their conduct. But he will not allow that, in any case, the probation can be carried so far, as to leave the man to the guidance of the same faculties, in attempting to ascertain whether the miracle proceeds from God or from some inferior agent. He asserts that miracles, apparently in support of error, never could be permitted for the trial of mankind, because, by their very nature, they are calculated to *command* belief; to *establish* falsehood, if produced in *behalf* of falsehood; and, therefore, that the exhibition of them negatives, at once, all notion of probation. But how, then, it may again be asked, are we to account for the permission of counterfeit miracles, closely resembling the true; so closely, at least, that they must, infallibly, produce the same effect on multitudes, as if they were true?—so closely, that it must often require profound discernment and laborious inquiry to find out the imposture. We see that it is consistent with the divine perfections to suffer large portions of mankind to be deceived; to expose them perpetually to delusions, which a vast proportion of them seem utterly unprepared to resist or to detect. If wicked men, then, are permitted to come forward with signs and “lying wonders, and all the deceivableness of unrighteousness,” how can we confidently venture to exclude the agency of “seducing spirits” from the dispensations of God.

To this question Farmer seems to think it a sufficient answer, that “against human craft, human caution is a sufficient security.”* Now this, as a mere abstract and theoretical proposition, may be true. It is true, just as another analagous proposition is true, respecting the intellectual faculties of man; namely, that they are adequate to the most abstruse and sublime discoveries of science. Thus, it is undoubtedly true, that the human powers are equal to the complicated task of calculating the moon’s motion. But it is also true that, under certain circumstances of disadvantage, a journey to the moon is not a whit more impracticable than any such scientific achievement. Precisely in the same manner, it may be allowed, that there is no instance of human craft, that may not be matched by the highest degree of human caution and sagacity. But then, it should be remembered, that there must be innumerable instances in which the caution is not, and cannot be, opposed to the fraud. There is, indeed, a great practical approximation to the truth of the maxim, in a state of advanced civilization, and diffused intelligence, more especially in those countries where a free press, with its ten thousand eyes and tongues, is ever on the watch to detect and proclaim deception. But what becomes of this assertion in darker and ruder times?

* See Farmer, ch. iv. s. 5.

What is a horde of barbarians, or even a tribe of ignorant peasants, to do against a fraternity of practised impostors? At all events, what a length of time may elapse, and what irreparable mischief may be done, before the cheat can be exposed, and proved to be the work of wicked men! And, in the interval, how does the condition of those who have been deceived differ from what it might have been, had preternatural powers been actually employed for their seduction?

It is obvious that Farmer has, throughout, lost sight of an important distinction, which, in all inquiries of this nature, should constantly be kept in mind; the distinction between error, which, from its very nature, is insurmountable by human faculties, however exalted or improved; and error, which is unavoidable by individuals placed in certain predicaments. That mankind will not be exposed to errors of the former description, we all are strongly impelled to believe. That many portions of mankind are actually exposed to errors of the latter kind is notorious and certain; and there seems no ground whatever for confidently dogmatizing as to the classes of created beings that may be made instrumental to such delusions.

In order, however, to place his doctrine in the strongest point of view, Farmer supposes the extreme case of a heathen, encouraged to persevere in idolatry by a miracle wrought expressly for the confirmation of that practice.* The heathen in that case, for aught that we can discern, would be scarcely blameable for yielding, if he were entirely without any antagonist evidence of equal strength. At all events, he would be neither more nor less blameable than he would have been for yielding to evidence which he honestly believed to be miraculous, though in reality it might be nothing but delusion. But, if he should have before him, at the same time, miraculous notices of the only true and righteous God, it is difficult to see how he could stand excused. It should not be forgotten, that idolatry is invariably connected, more or less, with moral depravity. Supposing, therefore, (which is the extremity of concession,) the miraculous proof on either side to be equally strong, it would, at worst, leave the man neutral, if he were not led by his corrupt passions to prefer the more licentious institution. If fire had come up from the earth to consume the sacrifice offered to Baal, when the flame descended from Heaven on the altar of Elijah, the idolatrous priests would doubtless have exulted; and the Israelites might, without blame, have felt more perplexity at such an appearance. But, even so, we know not that they would have been justified in at once deserting the

* Farmer, c. iv. s. 5.

God of their fathers, whose statutes were pure and holy, and whose outstretched arm had attended them for ages.

But, after all, the history of the divine dispensations presents us with no such cases. It seems, indeed, impossible, with the Bible open before us, to doubt that superhuman intelligences may have the power of working miracles. Whether that power be inherent in their nature, or only consigned to them by special appointment, is an inquiry of little moment: for if such beings be allowed to interfere at all in human affairs, their interference must, to us, be miraculous, whether they are acting within their own natural sphere or not. But the great and important circumstance to be observed, is, that the exercise of such power is always represented as under limitation and control. In the Old Testament, the nearest approach to a competition of miracles is to be found in the contest between Moses and the necromancers of Egypt. Now let us, purely for the sake of argument, imagine that those impostors had the advantage of preternatural aid; and let us see whether, even in that case, the contest, as it is recorded, could have left on any well-regulated mind, a doubt as to the conduct demanded by the occasion. The sorcerers, we will suppose, were enabled, by a confederacy with evil dæmons, to convert rods into serpents, and water into blood, and to bring up frogs upon the land. But here the efficacy of their enchantments ended; and they were themselves compelled to acknowledge the working of a superior agent. And then followed such an august display of supernatural power as must have convinced any sane mind, that, if there had been any conflict of superhuman agency, it was between inferior spirits and the arm of Omnipotence. What comparison could there be between the performance of the magicians, and the potent word which called hail and fire from heaven, which spread over the land a darkness that might be felt and which smote all the firstborn throughout the realm of Pharaoh? Let us imagine that we ourselves had been witnesses of these scenes, could we have hesitated a moment which to trust, the “juggling fiends” of Egypt, or the mighty God of “Israel”? Would it ever have occurred to us, that the “finger of the Lord” was to be resisted, because certain strange things had recently been achieved, either by crafty men, or deceiving spirits? Where, then, is the overpowering trial of faith or discernment, implied in such an exhibition?

If we turn to the New Testament, we shall find instances of dæmoniacal action, which all safe interpretation must pronounce to have been real.* The subject is, indeed, confessedly a

* “A late learned and ingenious author (Dr. Farmer) has written an elaborate dissertation to evince, that there was no real possession in the dæmoniacs mentioned in the

obscure and difficult one: but, whatever be its difficulty, it surely does not arise from any impeachment of the divine character implied in the reality of dæmoniacal possession. The torments endured were the same, whether inflicted by disease, or by the influence of evil spirits. Whether the possession were real or not, the belief of its reality was suffered to become almost universal in Judea. Those reasoners, therefore, who allow themselves a license of speculation, respecting what is, or is not, consistent with the divine benevolence, will be sure to find much the same difficulty in the subject, whether the possession be held to have been real or imaginary. Neither can any fair objection be raised on the ground, that, if evil spirits could work such miracles, no miracles whatever can be decisive of divine authority: for, whenever the influence of these beings on the faculties of men, is brought under notice in the Gospel history, it seems to have been, partly at least, for the purpose of showing, that it was an influence exercised purely by permission, and under perpetual superintendence and restriction. If we had been taught to believe, that the Lord had ever totally abandoned his dominion over evil spirits, even for a time, and had left them to the unbridled exercise of their malice, in torturing, distracting, and deceiving any portion of the human race—we might, perhaps, have been strongly tempted to distrust all miraculous evidence, and to wish for some scheme of interpreting Scripture which should relieve us from so much perplexity. But our faith can be

Gospel; but that the style there employed was adopted merely in conformity to popular prejudices, and used of a natural disease . . . Concerning his doctrine, I shall only say, in passing, that if there had been no more to urge from sacred writ, in favour of the common opinion, than the name of *δαμονιζόμενος*, or even the phrases *δαμόνιον ἔχειν*, *ἐκβάλλειν*, &c. I should have thought his explanation at least not improbable. But when I find mention made of the number of dæmons in particular possessions, their actions expressly distinguished from those of the man possessed, conversations held by the former, about the disposal of them, after their expulsion, and accounts given how they were actually disposed of; when I find desires and passions ascribed peculiarly to them, and similitudes taken from the conduct they usually observe; it is impossible for me to deny their existence, without admitting that the sacred historians were, either deceived themselves, in regard to them, or intended to deceive others. Nay, if they were faithful historians, this reflection, I am afraid, would strike still deeper.”—*Campbell on the Gospels*, vol. i. diss. vi. sect. 10.

“In the New Testament, where any circumstances are added concerning the dæmoniacs, they are generally such as show that there was something preternatural in the distemper; for these disordered persons agreed in one story, and paid homage to Christ and his apostles; which is not to be expected from madmen, of whom some would have worshipped, others would have reviled Christ, according to the various humour and behaviour observable in such persons.”—*Jortin. Rem. on Eccl. Hist.* vol. i. p. 10. Second Edition.

To which it may be added, that the language and conduct of our Saviour himself seems calculated to encourage the notion, that the patients were possessed by evil spirits, and not merely afflicted with epilepsy or madness.

in no danger of shipwreck, when we find that the infernal powers are produced, only to be rebuked and baffled. The dæmons are made subject even to the disciples of Christ: and Satan himself is seen falling, like lightning, from heaven. The right hand of God is put forth to restrain the malice of the Devil, as a pledge of the final and complete destruction of his kingdom.

On the whole, then, it appears, that, in our speculations respecting miracles, we are not required—because we are not enabled—to draw a clear line of restriction round the agency of invisible beings. But it also appears, that they who feel themselves compelled to admit the exercise of superhuman power by beings not absolutely divine, have nothing to apprehend from this admission. The only just inference from it is, that in this particular, as in many others, the divine government is profoundly mysterious. Inscrutable, however, as it is, there is nothing in this department of it to unsettle our reliance on miracles performed for purposes obviously unexceptionable and benevolent. There is in all the dealings of God, so much that is unfathomable by us, that it must be dangerous to frame our views upon the presumption, that this or that particular course of things is incompatible with his perfections. Whether by the agency of men or dæmons—certain it is, that delusions of the most abominable kind have been successfully practised. But this, assuredly, does not exempt us from the duty of exercising our judgment on every case of miraculous evidence connected with our salvation. And if we approach the task in a proper temper, we shall not fail to perceive, that the arm of the Lord has been revealed to us in a way that puts to shame all the works of darkness, whether carried on by human or by spiritual agency.

We trust that Mr. Penrose will not imagine that we have lost sight of him, or his treatise, in offering these remarks on the objectionable speculations of Farmer. We believe that we have advanced nothing but what is in full accordance with his own views. Our observations, indeed, are little more than an expansion of what is, very justly, suggested by himself, namely, “that it is by no means clearly necessary that God should protect our reasonings from all *possible* error with respect to miracles, more than other subjects.”—(p. 295.) And should any one complain, that his conscience and his judgment are destitute of a competent guide to conduct him through the difficulties incident to many imaginable cases of miraculous attestation, to Mr. Penrose’s preliminary dissertation, we should confidently refer him for satisfaction.

The principle there established by Mr. Penrose is as follows:—

First, that every superhuman act confers on the agent a superhuman authority, when appealed to for that purpose.

Secondly, that it may safely be concluded, that such authority is, not merely superhuman, but absolutely infallible and divine, unless one of two things can be shown; namely, that the pretensions of the agent involve some doctrine that is incredible or inadmissible, or that they are at variance with some authority unquestionably more potent. If, on the contrary, any inadmissible doctrine be involved, or any acknowledged and superior authority invaded, then we are bound either to suspend our judgment as to the performance of the miracle—(unless the evidence for it should appear quite irresistible)—or, at all events, to reject the pretensions of the person by whom the miracle is wrought. And, as to the difficulties which may, in some conceivable cases, attend the application of this rule, it is our duty to rely on the aid and guidance of that power, to whom we are taught to look under all other temptations.

For the establishment of these positions, Mr. Penrose appeals, as he is fully warranted in doing, to the moral and intellectual constitution of man. Wherever that constitution is tolerably sound, it will, of course, enable the inquirer to take the first of the above steps. No person in his senses can listen to a teacher who enlightens the blind, or calls down fire from heaven, without a much more profound submission, than he will render to an instructor, invested with no such superhuman powers. But, then, the *mere* exhibition of power, if wholly abstracted from all other considerations, will hardly be sufficient to make him bow to the superhuman authority, as positively infallible and supreme. He cannot be quite certain, that the wonders he has beheld may not be the work of some agent, inferior to the highest, but incomparably more potent than man. And though the power intrusted to such agents, either for good or evil, may be strictly limited, yet, if the limits which confine it are undiscernible by him, he can be in no condition to pronounce whether those limits have been passed or not.

How, then, is he to stir a step beyond the point to which he has advanced? How, but by following the natural impulses of a sound mind? And can it be doubted that these internal suggestions will lead him to reason thus: "I have before me the strongest evidence of an authority more than human. I further find myself incapable of questioning, that this evidence is, *primâ facie*, at least, a proof that the same authority is supreme. How, then, is this presumption to be converted into certainty? Clearly by the total absence of any thing to repel it. I feel, that in all cases it is unreasonable to refuse assent to the best evidence that can be

procured; that to do so, when the evidence is, of itself, nearly overpowering, and wholly uncontradicted, is little less than insanity. I shall, therefore, rely, without hesitation, on the miraculous evidence, as indicative of the divine will, unless it can be shown to involve any thing which renders that belief utterly untenable. If this reasoning be fallacious, the error seems to be one which no human integrity or wisdom can, under any circumstances whatever, possibly avoid: and there is something within me which dictates the assurance, that to such error the whole race of man never can be exposed."

Such appear to be, substantially, the views of Mr. Penrose, though not expressed exactly in his own words. We see no reason for withholding the fullest acquiescence in the criterion which he proposes. And, as for any practical difficulties which may occur in the use of it, they are such as never can "give pause" to any honest heart or unperverted understanding. Spinoza himself declares that, if he could be once persuaded that Lazarus had been raised from the dead, after lying four days in the grave, he would break his system to pieces, and embrace the Christian faith.* And we presume that there are few persons, (at least in Christian Europe) who, on witnessing such a scene, would not instantly throw away their doubts, without stopping to reason upon other cases of real or supposed miraculous interference.

But what, (it has been asked within our own knowledge,) what, if a person who had witnessed a miracle—for instance, the resurrection of Lazarus—should walk across the way, and there be present at the performance of another miracle, precisely similar, by another person of opposite pretensions? Would not these rival exhibitions shake to pieces his faith in all miraculous testimony? Would not one such instance for ever deprive all superhuman appearances of their power to command belief?

Now, in the first place, it may very safely be replied, that since the creation of the world, no instance similar to this has occurred; and that, to the end of time, as far as any thing may be averred with certainty, none such *ever will* occur. But, secondly, let us suppose the case to happen. Let us conceive a person to have beheld Lazarus rising up from the tomb. His impulse would undoubtedly be, at once to acknowledge that the person, at whose bidding the dead man came forth, was a teacher sent from God. And this impulse would be perfectly overpowering, unless something should occur to weaken, or to counteract it. Let us then, next, imagine that Judas Iscariot had at that time deserted his Master,

* Farmer, p. 110.

and that, on the very same day, another corpse were, to all appearance, restored to life at *his* word, in the presence of the very man who had witnessed the former miracle. What would be the conduct of that witness, supposing him to be a person of ordinary candour and discernment? Would he, without a moment's further examination, declare that, from thenceforth, he should consider all miraculous evidence as good for nothing?—that the proof must be worthless which could be brought forward by two such opposite characters?—that the miracles could give him no sort of confidence in the pretensions of either; and that, therefore, he should reject the authority of both? Would he not rather fall back on his convictions that the world is governed by a righteous and holy God, the source of all power and might? And would not these convictions compel him to pause awhile, and to suspend his judgment, in full confidence that, in the end, he should be graciously conducted through his difficulty? Or, if the agony of his embarrassment should, for the time, overpower the principle of faith within him, would he not, at least, feel himself prompted to compare the consequences of admitting the claim of one or other of these two wonder-workers? and (till his doubts should finally be cleared up) to take *him* for his guide, whose doctrine or pretensions involved nothing repugnant to the unalterable principles of right? Would not this be a much more safe and righteous course in him, than to distort and dislocate his faculties by an effort to throw off the pressure of all miraculous evidence; an effort which never can be made without the utmost violence to our nature? We are so constituted, that the concurrence of a superhuman act with unimpeachable tenets must be sufficient to compel the assent of every sound intellect. If a case should occur in which the condition of an unquestionable doctrine was wanting, or which presented the appearance of conflicting authorities, much perplexity and confusion would doubtless ensue. But the only way out of the difficulty would be to follow the guidance of our moral instinct, which, unless enfeebled or perverted, will always tell us that, miracle or no miracle, wrong never can be changed into right; and that signs and wonders, without end, could never justify us in embracing folly, unrighteousness, or impiety.

As for the case where the supernatural display, and the doctrines or principles connected with it, should be equally unexceptionable, on either side, we cannot insult our readers by wasting a thought upon it. That such a case never can occur, will readily be allowed by all who do not love disputation better than truth, and who have not lost all trust in the moral government of God.

We trust that the above statements will be amply sufficient to expose the despicable sophistry, which charges the friends of revealed religion with, first, proving the doctrine by the miracle, and then the miracle by the doctrine. One really would imagine, to hear the crowings and chucklings of the philosophers over this unhappy paralogism, that the believers were in the habit of debating with their adversaries after the following notable and sagacious fashion:—

“How can you, gentlemen freethinkers, reject the doctrines of Revelation, when you find them attested by such illustrious and astonishing miracles?”

“How? Why, in the first place, we doubt whether the miracles ever were performed; and, at all events, it is impossible to know whether they were wrought by divine authority or not.”

“O! but how can you entertain a moment’s doubt respecting these two points, when you see what glorious and heavenly doctrines we have to produce for their establishment?”

Now, most assuredly, if believers could be convicted of having so long contentedly followed their noses about such a circle as this, they would be fit for the very highest distinctions in the famous University of Noodledom; and would deserve nothing better than to be lashed for ever, with all their honours thick upon them, round that same circle, by the “puniest whipsters” of the infidel school. Before, however, they are invested with their suit of motley, it may be as well that they should be allowed distinctly to state for themselves the process by which they arrive at their convictions.

In the first place, then, they believe Jesus of Nazareth to be a teacher of superhuman authority, because he did such mighty works as exceed the power of man.

Secondly, finding neither in his own life and precepts, nor in the pretensions of other teachers, any thing to limit their reliance on that authority, they hesitate not to confide in it as absolutely conclusive and divine.

Thirdly, on the strength of his divine commission they receive all his sayings, and believe him to be the Christ the son of the living God.

Fourthly, perceiving the truths revealed by him to be capable of a highly moral and beneficial application, they feel strongly confirmed in the justness of their conclusion.

Lastly, being thus assured of his plenary authority, they rest on it, not only as proving his own *peculiar* doctrines, but as furnishing an additional and independent sanction to all the moral principles involved in his teaching. So that morality, which before may have appealed only to reason, now appeals to revelation also.

Now we should be glad to learn where is the illogical assumption in this proceeding? We have assumed, as an ultimate truth, what we suppose no one will deny, that man only obeys a natural impulse when he suffers himself to be powerfully influenced by great authority. We have also assumed that the inquirer is in a tolerable state of moral sanity; that he has in him the elements of morality; for, otherwise, the second step in the above process, if taken at all, would be taken in pure ignorance and blindness. Without such assumption, how could man pretend to be qualified for any inquiry relating to morals or religion? And what sceptic is there so besotted as to maintain, that, before we can become impartial judges in such questions, we must get rid of all our moral preferences and antipathies? No: the argument, as we have put it above, does not circulate. It does not merely bring us back to the point where we began. It sets off from the firm ground of instinctive moral perception; but it pursues a path which rises at every step, till it leads us round to a position infinitely more elevated and commanding than that from which we started; a position which enables us to survey, more clearly than before, all the grand truths of natural religion, while at the same time it opens a prospect of still greater magnificence, even the kingdom of the Redeemer, with "the glory thereof."

Let us hear no more then of the charge, that doctrines are produced by us in proof of miracles. It is not so. We only take care to ascertain that the teacher propounds nothing to shake the power, which miracles *naturally* possess, of commanding human assent. In doing this, we have recourse, it is true, to certain principles, without which man would be no more fit to institute the inquiry at all, than the calves of the field, and the asses of the desert. And surely it is not too much to say, that those principles (though they may derive fresh sanction from miracles,) are such as no miraculous evidence can overthrow. If a teacher were one hour to raise the dead, and the next hour were to propose, on the strength of that wonder, a scheme of faith and practice, which should confound the land-marks of good and evil, who can doubt that we should be fully justified in disregarding his miracles, and in rejecting his doctrine? The only proper reply to him would be—"Get thee behind me, Satan!"

By way of illustrating these views, let us suppose that an ambassador produces his credentials to a foreign prince, and that they appear to be in all respects complete. The next step is to examine the proposals which the representative is instructed to make on the behalf of his master. If they contain nothing grossly improbable or strange, the negociation proceeds, of course, without any question as to the ambassador's authority. But what if it

should appear that his instructions are outrageously extravagant, or egregiously trifling and absurd—at variance with the obvious interests and the known character of his employer, or in direct opposition to the plainest elements of international law? Would not the members of the cabinet begin to look at each other? Would they not be strongly tempted to surmise, that they might possibly have given too hasty a recognition to the powers of the negociator? Would they not suspect that they had been dealing with a person who had somehow or other fraudulently intruded himself into the diplomatic functions? And would not these suspicions lead them to look again, and a little more closely, at his credentials, and to see whether they could not discover there some traces of forgery and imposture? And what would be their astonishment at seeing one of their own body get up to protest against this proceeding—to condemn it as unworthy of reasonable and enlightened men!—to charge his colleagues with a breach of all the rules of logic—and to declare that he should be ashamed to act with men who could first examine the credentials of an envoy to authenticate his alleged instructions, and then canvass his instructions, in order either to verify or disparage his credentials!

This imaginary case seems to furnish as exact an illustration of the question as can be derived from any proceedings between mere human parties. And if it should be urged that miracles form a species of credential so essentially different from every other, that if they are not *in all cases* positively conclusive of the supreme authority of the agent, they can *in no case* be worthy of regard,—we can only reply, that to assert this, is to assume the whole matter in debate.

But it will be thought high time that Mr. Penrose should be heard upon this point, which, it may readily be imagined, he has not overlooked.

“We do not adduce the probability of the doctrine as affecting in any degree the proper strength of that testimony which we allege for the truth of the performance of the miracle; but only as increasing the capability of the thing taught to be sustained or supported by that same testimony.

“Nor is this mode of proceeding by any means peculiar to this particular case, in which the question is that of the evidences of religion, but is also adopted in almost all questions whatever, which the human faculties can be applied to discuss, as one of the best recognized laws of evidence. It is a fundamental principle that no testimony whatever can establish any known or clear contradiction to any truth already certain and allowed. It has already been shown that all vehement improbabilities approach to the nature of such contradictions. Supposing the evidence a known and definite power, every greater degree of improbability

is justly and strictly to be accounted a greater weight which that one and the same power has to sustain : and though some powers are equal to sustain enormous weights, yet if we allow any case to be once brought into question, we are entitled to argue, that the less the weight, or the greater the probability, the more constantly and certainly it may be sustained. Thus the same evidence on which we credit a probable, we habitually distrust, for an improbable, story. Byron's account of a race of giants in Patagonia, was discredited even on its first publication, by persons who certainly never thought of doubting that he had really anchored on the coast of that country. We have both parts of the relation on the same authority ; yet the authority, which is equal to prove the probable, is not equal to sustain with the same assurance the improbable part of it.

“ So also as to miracles : and on the very same principle. And it is particularly to be observed with regard to almost all doubtful miracles, or miracles with regard to which men keep their judgments suspended, that some apparent probability possessed by those miracles is commonly the sole reason which operates to prevent their absolute, and perhaps universal rejection.”—pp. 212—214.

And again, having observed that the miracles of scripture take a firmer hold on the mind, “ because its doctrines are eminently probable, exactly coincident with what we know, from nature, of God, and with what we know of the moral faculties of mankind,” he adds, very justly :—

“ It is possible that all persons may not be able to appreciate this probability. But, as in that most just argument for the existence of God, which we derive from the common consent of mankind, we do not disallow the great mass of this evidence, because there may have been some few persons too ignorant to know, or too vicious to be disposed to believe in him, so also as to the probability of the Christian religion. There may be many minds too much imbruted in sense ; there may be many too much vitiated by pleasure, and many others too conceited and overweening, to be able to discern the just claims of a religion, which calls on man to be wise and holy ; which teaches him that in his relation to God, he must abjure the feeling of self-dependence, and bring every thought into obedience to Christ. But if these very ends be the best moral ends of religion, its having these ends is in fact its highest probability. And the goodness or probability of these ends is to be judged of, not indeed by the prejudices of a Christian education, however salutary some of those prejudices may be, but still less by the known prejudices of vice, by brutal ignorance, or by proud impiety. In every nation, and in every age, he that feareth God, and worketh righteousness, is the judge of the probability of the Christian system, in the degree in which its merits can be laid fairly before him : and that persons of this class are they who account it most probable, is, I believe, a fact which it would be quite idle to deny.

“ It therefore is evident that the probability of our religion, supposing that we substantiate that probability, must weigh as an argument of the

reality of those miracles which we find brought to attest it. Nothing, I think, can be more indisputable than this conclusion; nothing more certain than that the Christian religion possesses, to every unprejudiced eye, which is able to take in all its pretensions, the highest probability of a divine original."—pp. 217—219.

A similar view is taken by Tucker, a writer of acknowledged acuteness, and whose habits of thought were as remote as can well be imagined from a servile acquiescence in established notions. He illustrates the subject in his usual style of ingenuity and originality:—

"If (says he) a man of honest, judicious character, but a little straightened in present cash, should receive a strong impression in a dream, that his deceased friend had bid him look under a particular bush, where he should find a purse of money; though he had no faith in dreams, it is very likely he might have the curiosity to poke about a little under the bush. If the direction had been, to lay five guineas there, which, on his returning, the day after, he should find grown to an hundred, he would hardly care to run the risk: yet, upon the advice being repeated four or five successive nights, with pressing entreaties and expostulations, he might be tempted to try the experiment. But, if he were commanded to break open a neighbour's house for the money, with an assurance of the deed being lawful and safe, I imagine he would require a better warrant than even twenty dreams, before he would proceed to execution. In like manner, if other persons had told him of having had such dreams, and found them accomplished in all points, upon following their directions, he would want different degrees of evidence to convince him of their being true.

"Therefore, where the facts reported are frivolous, unbecoming, or repugnant to our ideas of justice and mercy, they carry a higher degree of improbability on that very account: for though we have not so perfect a knowledge of what is agreeable to wisdom and goodness, as to render every thing appearing foolishness and evil, incredible, yet we must and ought to give their due weight to the judgments of our understanding, that salutary guide given us from God, for our general direction."—*Tucker*, vol. v. c. 11. pp. 493, 494, 495.

And to this it may be added, that the same considerations by which we pronounce on the credibility of a miracle, may fairly be resorted to, for the purpose of judging whether it came from God, should we feel ourselves unable to question its actual performance.

It is most truly observed by Mr. Penrose, that Scripture and reason conspire to sanction the two conditions, on which he insists, as a criterion; namely, a credible doctrine, and an unrivalled authority (p. 26, &c.). The first instance which he produces is the celebrated passage in Deuteronomy:—"If there arise among you a prophet, or a dreamer of dreams, and giveth

thee a sign or a wonder, and the sign or the wonder come to pass, whereof he spake unto thee, let us go after other Gods . . . thou shalt not hearken unto the words of that prophet . . . *for the Lord your God proveth you . . .* and that prophet, or that dreamer of dreams shall be put to death, because he hath spoken to turn you away from the Lord your God, which brought you out of the land of Egypt," &c. &c. &c. (Deut. xiii. v. 1—5.) In this passage there is no assertion that the sign or the wonder must necessarily be the sole work of human imposture. It merely inculcates upon the Israelites, that, in such a case, they might spare themselves the labour of any reasoning or inquiry on the subject. With the prophet or the dreamer they were to have nothing to do, but to reject him, and to stone him; and this, whether the fraud were purely his own, or carried into effect by supernatural help. And why were they to deal thus, even in the teeth of an appeal, verified by the event? Because the doctrine taught was idolatry; because the authority defied was that of Jehovah, whose uplifted hand had delivered them from the house of bondage; and because their allegiance to Him ought to be proof against all power brought into competition with his Omnipotence.

Again, when our Lord was charged with casting out devils, by the aid of Beelzebub their prince, his reply left untouched the question, whether the wicked spirits really possessed any influence in such cases. It seemed tacitly, indeed, to admit that they did possess it; but it turned chiefly on the absurdity of supposing, that, if such power really belonged to Satan, he would arm any one with it against his own dominion. In other words, it appealed to the whole tenor of our Lord's doctrine and ministry, which were in direct and notorious opposition to all the purposes for which the powers of hell could be supposed to interfere in the concerns of men. Here then is a case of miracles, which leaves it, at least uncertain, whether evil beings could not perform the like; but, which refers us at once to the principles and the doctrines connected with their performance, as a test whereby to determine whether they indicated a divine authority, or not. Our Lord, therefore, proposes a principle sufficient to guide us in every similar difficulty, and to distinguish, at all times, between the craft of the devil and the wisdom of God.

Once more; St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Galatians, says, "though an angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you, than that which we have preached, let him be accursed:" a sentence which requires us to confront the miracle and the doctrine together, before we admit the authority of the former. It is to no purpose to say, that this is a burst of rhetoric,

introduced for the purpose of emphasis and impression. It may be so. But, like all good rhetoric, it assumes nothing that is not founded on reason and truth. St. Paul, of course, could not mean to intimate that an angel *would* ever display his superhuman power, for the perversion of the gospel of Christ. But he, doubtless, did intend to declare, that, even if such a case should happen, it would be the fault of the converts themselves, if they were not proof against the delusion. And if, at this day, Satan should clothe himself as an angel of light, and should propose any other name whereby men might be saved, but that of Jesus Christ, they who might be misled by him would certainly not have to plead, as their excuse, the insuperable force of the seduction.

So much for the error of those who conceive that any instance of supernatural action, produced, to all appearance, for the purposes of falsehood, disarms and disqualifies for ever all the miraculous testimony that can be alleged in support of truth. Of this error we think Mr. Penrose has completely disposed. The result of his whole argument appears to be this:—We cannot positively *demonstrate* that we are secure from impenetrable deceptions, practised upon us by invisible beings. But, nevertheless, we are so framed, that the first and natural effect of a miracle is to seize forcibly on our convictions. This power over the mind it will most certainly retain, unless the belief of it should appear to be incumbered with some dead weight of absurdity, licentiousness or impiety. Should this, however, be the case, from that instant the wonder begins to lose its hold. Its grasp relaxes gradually, and suffers us, at length, to retreat towards those imperishable principles, whose authority is superior to the force of any contrary evidence. Should the miracle be loaded with no such difficulty, we *inevitably* acquiesce in the authority indicated by it, as absolutely infallible.

The value of the principles established by Mr. Penrose, is not to be estimated solely by their application to the doubts and difficulties which may occur to Europeans in studying the evidences of the religion which they profess. They deserve the deepest attention of all persons, who purpose to engage in missionary labours among the nations of the east; especially those who have embraced the faith of Mahomet. The necessity of a very careful and very peculiar preparation for such labours, is forcibly shown, by a recent publication, edited by Professor Lee, in 1824, viz. *Controversial Tracts on Christianity and Mohammedanism*, between the late Henry Martyn and certain Persian Docters of Islamism. To these tracts, Mr. Penrose has alluded in his Preface; and from them it appears that the

Christian Missionary in those countries has impediments to encounter entirely remote from all European apprehension. He will find adversaries whose strength lies in their very ignorance and perverseness. His condition will somewhat resemble that of an accomplished master of any exercise or pastime, who is liable to be perpetually defeated and confounded by the anomalous movements of an antagonist imperfectly versed in the true principles of the game. He will be met, at every turn, with objections which he would hardly have expected even from intellects in a state of pupilage. He will perceive himself to be engaged with minds, which have all the subtlety, indeed, but little of the solidity and good sense, which belongs to mature age. He will accordingly feel, at times, as if his own superior discernment and intelligence did but embarrass him, and disqualify him for the contest. He must consent to meet the adverse party upon ground which has long been abandoned, if it ever was occupied, in more enlightened communities. Of the disadvantages that will be arrayed against him, some notion may be formed by a statement of the leading principles current among the Mahomedan divines, on the subject of miracles. They maintain, then, that we can pronounce nothing to be miraculous, until we are in full and perfect possession of all that can be accomplished by human ingenuity and science. Is water turned into wine? the most eminent alchymists of the age must be assembled to determine whether we can safely pronounce such a change to be the effect of superhuman power. Should inveterate diseases be healed, or faculties restored to the disabled, our judgment must be suspended, until an inquest of physicians shall have sat upon the case, and decided on its character. Should tempests be silenced, or the dead raised, by a word, nothing is to be concluded from the wonder, unless a synod of magicians should declare that such an achievement is beyond the resources of their art. From these principles it would follow, that as the world is in a state of improvement, it cannot be known till the day of judgment, whether extraordinary acts are miraculous or not.* They maintain, further, that the evidence of those facts, which Jews and Christians call miraculous, is becoming constantly feebler by lapse of time; and that, in the course of centuries, it must waste away into insignificance.

It may be asked, then, how it is that the Mahometans have agreed to regard Moses and Jesus Christ as invested with the prophetic office at all, or to allow that any miracle ever was wrought by them? The answer truly is, that we are *wholly* indebted for this concession to the declaration of their own pro-

* Controv. Tracts, pp. 194. 215.

phet!—and that, but for him, the world would, to this day, have remained in utter ignorance whether the wonders related in our Scriptures were wrought by power from on high, or merely by virtue of an acquaintance with certain occult powers of nature. Take the statement of one of the Persian disputants:

“As to the miracles of Moses and Jesus being equally convincing, we say we owe this to the relation of a prophet, namely, Mohammed. And upon the supposition of his having withheld his testimony to this point, we should not have had the means of forming an opinion, much less of obtaining an assurance, that they were prophets, and their works miracles.”—*Controv. Tracts*, p. 241.

The question then occurs, how is it that they have contrived to satisfy themselves that the pretensions of their own prophet were well founded? And here we have a most remarkable instance of the perverse ingenuity which sometimes leads men to glory in that which is their shame, and to derive strength and confidence from that which is their weakness! They lay it down as a maxim, that any one who does a wonderful act,—who appeals to that act in support of his prophetic authority,—and accompanies it by a successful challenge to all the world to perform the like, has a claim to the belief and obedience of mankind. And they affirm that Mahommed is the only teacher who has, beyond all question, satisfied these conditions. The Koran is *his* wonderful work. To that he appealed for the establishment of his authority. And the work itself abounds with repeated challenges to all mankind to produce a single sentence that approaches it in beauty and grandeur. These challenges have been unanswered for 1200 years. It may, therefore, safely be presumed, that they will remain unanswered till the end of time; and that to rival even a line of this one book, is a task which exceeds all the resources of genius or science. Besides, the wonders performed by Moses or Jesus were designed purely to make an impression on vulgar minds in a state of society comparatively rude and dark; and whatever force may have belonged to them, the lapse of ages has ever since been wearing away. The Koran, on the contrary, is a permanent and incomparable miracle. It is addressed purely to the intellect. Every year that elapses, and every advance that is made in mental attainment, does but contribute strength to its evidence; for the greater the improvement of the human powers, the more complete must be the triumph of that work, which continues to defy all competition!

Now, when it appears that such opinions as these are current among the learned professors of a religion, credited by so many millions of the human race,—opinions which represent the Scripture miracles as *wholly inconclusive*,—it is highly important that all who propose to themselves a conflict with the errors of that

religion, should very distinctly count the cost, and survey the difficulties, of such a warfare. And, for this reason, we should earnestly recommend to such persons a careful study of Mr. Penrose's book, as containing the soundest principles, relative to this subject, in which the missionary can be trained. At the same time, it would be somewhat too sanguine to suppose, that the principles laid down by him *must* be decisive in the controversy with a Mahometan. Before complete success can be expected, the Musulman must be persuaded to lay aside some of his peculiar notions respecting miraculous agency. The principle of Mr. Penrose is this: that an act above human power indicates a superhuman authority, if connected with a credible doctrine, and confronted by no superior authority. Now this the adversary might possibly grant: but then he would be certain to reply, that an act *not above human power* can confer no superhuman authority, let the doctrine be what it may; and then he would add, that the wonders shown by Moses or by Jesus, do not *certainly* indicate any superhuman agency; but, on the contrary, are unquestionably within the compass of human art. If, according to their notions, magic necessarily implied a confederacy with superhuman agents, then Mr. Penrose's principles might be brought at once to bear directly on the question. But, unhappily, magic appears to be regarded by Mahometans as a purely human accomplishment; as a science of extreme difficulty indeed, and of rare acquisition, but accessible to minds of superior energy and penetration. A proficiency in it, therefore, confers, in their estimation, no divine or even superhuman sanction on the adept, more than a proficiency in any other abstruse art. The antagonist of Martyn would, probably, decline to acknowledge a claim of prophetic authority, on the strength of the pretender's walking on the sea, or raising the dead, just as he would refuse to receive Sir Humphry Davy for a prophet, merely on the strength of a most astonishing course of chemical experiments.

That the above is a just representation of the notions entertained by every learned Musulman, respecting the powers of magic, may be seen from the words of Mohammed Ruza, in his reply to Martyn:—

“ It is very well known that acts, in all appearance similar to those performed by the prophets, have been performed by sorcerers, magicians, and jugglers. . . . Those who are skilled in talismans or necromancy have performed, and do still perform, such wonders as to effect a change in the real essence of things. They are able so to affect the winds, as to restrain them from blowing; both men and animals, so as to deprive them of motion. Besides, there was a well known magician who kept seven camels in a string, and who, entering in at the mouth of

the first, and passing out at his tail, would, with the greatest ease, pass through them all."—*Controv. Tracts*, p. 207.

And again,—

"Although the restoration of a dead man to life by Jesus cannot be ascribed to the effect of medicine, (which has nothing to do with the mere enunciation of a word, or the exertion of the will,) still it might be ascribed to enchantment. For we ourselves have witnessed the recovery from pains and fevers effected by mere incantation: from a few lines drawn upon a wall, much trouble and distress caused: and the spleen removed by driving a nail only into the middle of a cube! It will be difficult to say whether any of the acts of Moses or Jesus exceeded these; or whether any one who can remove a pain or a fever by no other means than merely reciting an incantation, may not, also, restore one to life who has been three days dead. We believe he may restore one who has been dead a much longer time!

"If it be objected that no enchanter has hitherto appeared who has, either by art or the operation of medicine, restored a dead man to life, we reply: It is sufficient for us, if they have performed what we have already mentioned; for their inability to do the rest may have resulted from *their want of experience*; as it is well known that very few acquainted with these arts have hitherto appeared in the world; and that, therefore, the *power of human nature*, in these respects, is not yet so far known, as to make it certain that any one thus skilled may not also restore a corpse to life."—*Controv. Tracts*, p. 211—213.

Now, what is to be done with people who are in such a state of mind as this? What can be hoped from the advancement of the soundest principles in opposition to such barbarous ignorance and credulity? We have here precisely the same stupid and childish persuasion of the reality of enchantment, as that which often retarded the reception of the Gospel in the primitive ages. And all argument must be utterly vain, until this persuasion shall have retired before the light of a sounder philosophy, and a juster view of the limits of human power; such a view, for instance, as that which is given by Mr. Penrose in the first chapter of his work.

An enlightened and impartial moderator over the dispute would, indeed, find but little difficulty in deciding it, even without an absolute and total rejection of the Mahometan notions. He would see, that when an important and beneficial revelation is attested by stupendous wonders, it is little less than downright insanity to question it, because, forsooth, there is surmised to exist a certain rare, occult, and mysterious science, whose powers, for any thing that can positively be known to the contrary, may be adequate to the production of similar effects. He would perceive, that, in such a case, we are no more warranted in resorting to the supposition of magic, than to that of an interference by superhuman beings, independently of God. He would further

not fail to observe, that, by the concession of the adversary,* no magician has yet been found who has restored a corpse to life; and that, therefore, we have no reason to believe that such an achievement is within the powers of enchantment. And if it were urged, that things as difficult have been notoriously accomplished by magicians; he would remark that our *confessed* ignorance respecting the extent of magical agency, disables us from pronouncing as to the comparative difficulty of its operations. He would, also, observe, that whenever a pretender to the prophetic character performs an act apparently above human power, and appeals to it in support of his pretensions, that very appeal virtually involves a public challenge to the performance of similar prodigies. Now it is obvious that Jesus appealed to his wondrous works, as evidences of his character: and yet the raising of Lazarus, and his own resurrection and ascension, are events, which, for 1800 years, have never been rivalled or approached. All this, and much more to the same purpose, would naturally suggest itself to a plain, unmythified understanding. But all this, we have very little doubt, would be urged quite in vain upon Hagi Elharamein Mohammed Ruza of Hamadan, or upon Mirza Ibrahim, preceptor of all the Moolas †

But even if we were to succeed with the professors of Mohammedism in this part of the argument, a still more serious difficulty would remain; namely, the adventure of dislodging them from that other refuge of lies, their belief that the Koran is, itself, the most stupendous and irrefragable of all miracles, and sufficient to exalt their Prophet very far above Moses or Jesus Christ. It appears to us that this is a notion which can hardly be expected to yield to any process of reasoning. It is a mixed affair of taste and superstition, two of the most intractable elements that argument can have to encounter. It is a prejudice which probably never will give way to any direct assault. A wider acquaintance with the literature and science of other nations, and especially of Christian Europe, might gradually make some impression upon it, if such enlarged knowledge were not interdicted by the very spirit of the Mohammedan faith. Professor Lee evidently considers the case as hopeless; and, accordingly, recommends that the ground of miracles be altogether abandoned, and that of prophecy assumed, as affording much more safe and advantageous positions against a Mohammedan disputant. We cannot, however, but think that the Musulman might, at least, be silenced (though he certainly would not be convinced) by the retort, that if the Koran be a miracle, it is a miracle only to the Arabs; and

* Controv. Tracts p. 213.

† See Controv. Tracts, preface, p. cxv. cxl.

to few, probably, except the learned and accomplished, among them : that the rest of the world must judge of it by a translation, as the generality of Christians judge of their Scriptures ; and that, under this disadvantage, which is common to both, the Bible appears to us in all respects incomparably superior to the Koran.

Notwithstanding all these obstacles, however, we fully agree with Mr. Penrose, that it is of the last importance to have the whole question of miracles, in all its bearings, accurately settled. The argument respecting them is a weapon, which should be brought to its highest perfection of keenness and brightness ; and should be kept in readiness to assail this monster, if ever it should be stripped of the scaly epidermis, which now seems to render it invulnerable. And it must be allowed, that the skill and labour of Mr. Penrose have been eminently valuable in preparing the weapon for this conflict, and for every other service in which it can be employed.

The above speculations have detained us much longer than we originally intended. They relate, however, to matters of measureless importance. And we have for this reason been unwilling to resist the impulse communicated to our own thoughts by the work of Mr. Penrose ; or to neglect an opportunity of co-operating with him, in the attempt to give a right direction to the minds of persons sincerely inquiring into the grounds of their faith. We regret, however, that these discussions have left us so little space to devote to the main body of the work, which is well worthy of a full and careful analysis.

We have had occasion already to advert incidentally to the First Chapter, the object of which is, to prove that those facts, which are related in Scripture as miraculous, were so in reality ; that is, were acts clearly and unequivocally superhuman. And this, of course, involves the discussion of a question, to which we have before alluded ; namely, the extent of mere human knowledge and power.

The Second Chapter is divided into six sections, and contains an array of the evidence we possess of the actual performance of those wonderful works. In considering the direct evidence, Mr. Penrose makes a judicious selection of four examples, in order to exhibit, broadly and distinctly, the foundation of our assent to the fact, that such things were really and truly accomplished—viz. (1.) The pillar of fire and cloud which conducted the Israelites. (2.) The restoration of the blind man to sight, as recorded in the 9th chapter of St. John. (3.) The resurrection of Lazarus ; and (4.) our Saviour's own resurrection. The author then considers all the auxiliary evidences : disposes of the objections, that our proof is derived from interested parties ; or that it is enfeebled by lapse of ages ; and shows that, though time may weaken the

power of the strongest evidence to impress and interest the attention, it never can destroy or diminish the real weight and value of such evidence. The sixth section recapitulates the preceding arguments and conclusions, and shows the futility of the hypothesis, that credulity made the disciples believers; and that their enthusiasm, seconded by pious fraud, propagated their belief throughout the Jewish and Gentile world.

From this chapter we might easily select abundant extracts, calculated to show the patient meditation with which the author has explored all the depths of his subject. There are, however, few parts of the treatise to which the attention of the reader might be more profitably directed, than to the latter part of Section III. We all know that the love of the marvellous is a most valuable and convenient topic in the hands of the freethinkers. It saves them a world of thought and research. Into this quality they resolve all the histories of preternatural agency. Mankind, they tell us, are by nature voraciously credulous; and superstition is intensely contagious; and, as for enthusiasm, its operation is absolutely electrical: it is propagated with the force and rapidity exhibited by the galvanic battery. Accordingly, the demand for wonders has, in every age, been so universal, and so insatiable, that wise men have thought it necessary to provide a vast limbo, amply stored with every imaginable variety of prodigies, in which the public mind might at all times expatiate and take its pastime. That this is the right solution of all questions relative to miracles is obvious: for has not Dr. Johnson himself told us, that he would make half London believe that they had seen a man walk across the Thames, dry-shod? and why, then, should not Moses make the Israelites believe that they had themselves walked dry-shod over an arm of the Red Sea? There is no portent in the annals of the marvellous that was ever more greedily swallowed, than this notable account of all wonders is received, from the mouths of their professors, by the scholars of the *freethinking school*—falsely so called!—the school, rather, whose disciples would more willingly endure a month at the Brixton tread-wheel, than encounter, for half an hour, the toil of *really* thinking for themselves. We wish the masters and pupils of this *ludus impudentiæ* no worse a penance, than to lay aside their nonsensical and lying vanities, and to pass a little time with Mr. Penrose. It would be weariness to their very flesh to come to close quarters with an honest and steady thinker. But the discipline would be wondrous salutary! And to such among them as have not yet their “whole head sick, and their whole heart faint,” with the enervating influences of their vile Castle of Indolence, we would earnestly recommend the following consi-

derations. After remarking, that in all questions of evidence, the character of the witnesses is a point of primary importance, Mr. Penrose proceeds thus:—

“ But the Scripture witnesses are in all respects unimpeachable. Nothing can be less tumultuary, nothing less enthusiastical, than the whole style and character of all their relations. I know of no narratives composed by leaders of parties, as the sacred historians, no doubt, in some sense were, in which there exists, together with the same perfect sincerity, so little of that natural heat with which an actor relates acts of his own, or with which a follower details the history of his chief. They are all written with a very impressive, but at the same time with a very subdued, tone of feeling. They are all the compositions of grave and sober men, who had a degree of sadness mixed up in their composition, or who appear to have written under a most awful sense of their high responsibility for the exact accuracy of their relations. They report the life and doctrines of a divine instructor: they think themselves made ‘a spectacle unto the world, and to angels, and to men.’* They recount their own errors, and even their incredulities, and this humbly, not in that confident boasting of which vice is often made the occasion. Are these the men of whom, under all these circumstances, we are to suppose it imaginable that they were so blinded by enthusiasm that they could not discern the clear evidence of the senses?

“ In the Epistles, no doubt, written by some of these very men, a great ardour, or it may be said enthusiasm, is to be discerned. But then this is only the natural consequence of an entire conviction of the truth of the fact, and also a consequence which that conviction must have produced even in men of the most cautious temperaments. To be cautious in receiving all new facts and opinions, and to be ardent in asserting them when we are convinced of their truth, is the very perfection of our active and intellectual powers. And that the coolest and wariest of all the disciples, who may have examined most critically all the evidence of Christ’s miracles, should become on conviction a most zealous assessor of all the doctrines which his divine master delivered, should put forth in his teaching all the spirit of a devotee, is only a consequence in the natural order of things: or rather it proves that those teachers who were first entrusted with the promulgation of our holy religion, were selected with that consummate knowledge of the human heart which belongs in perfection to Him only who formed it. Thus it appears to me certain that the natural temper of the witnesses was that of men in whom, if we can confide in any man, we may confide as being accurate judges of fact, as persons not likely to be carried away by credulity.

“ The most important point, however, is, that all credulity requires a previous disposition either to believe the particular fact proposed to it, or in the case of a miracle, to side with that cause in which the miracle is said to have been performed. If, in a question relating to matters of fact, we have reason to distrust the evidence of a mob, or of any individual whose powers of discrimination we are inclined either to suspect

* 1 Cor. iv. 9.

or deny, it is because their prejudices are on that side to which they de-
pose. One of those prejudices, it may be said, is the love of the mar-
vellous.—But it is not so in cases where the belief of the marvellous runs
counter to any other prepossessions either more rooted, or equally rooted,
in the mind. Even in the most stupid and ignorant men the love of
the marvellous, or, it may be said, credulity in general, is certainly not
more strongly rooted than the contrary vice of a stubborn resistance to
evidence, where the evidence is for what they do not choose to believe.
He who will obstinately resist equal proof of another kind will resist
obstinately also the evidence of miracles. ‘They who believe not Moses
and the prophets, will not be persuaded though one rose from the dead.’
If we regard the miracles of the Abbé Paris as genuine, we cannot doubt
but that the Jesuits were no less inclined to refuse the credit which was
justly due to them, than if we regard them as having been only falla-
cious, we conclude in like manner that it was the inclination of the
Jansenists to embrace them with far more eagerness than they were
worth.

“But the miracles which were performed by Moses and Christ are
wholly clear of every possible imputation of resting on the evidence of
men who *swallowed* them greedily. Of the temper of the Jews in their
passage to Canaan, if we know any thing, we know that their prepos-
sessions were to return to Egypt, to rebel against Moses, to prefer Korah,
Dathan, and Abiram, to him. Assuredly, with this temper, they were
far more likely to dispute a true miracle than to believe in a false. And
with regard to our Saviour, we have not only the testimony of enemies,*
but also the testimony which we have of the friends of the religion is the
testimony of men whose prepossessions could not have warped them in
bearing witness to the miracles which they record.”—(pp. 152—157.)

In Chapter III. it is shown, by a satisfactory investigation, that
imposture never was supported by such evidence as that by
which the Scripture miracles are established. In the course of
this chapter some very judicious and acute remarks are intro-
duced respecting the attempt of Julian to rebuild the Jewish
temple. The following observations on that subject appear to
us highly important.

“I have to add, also, farther, that this miracle comes to us on far less
evidence than the Christian miracles, because it is less connected with
other facts, or with history. This story of Julian is of a mere insulated
fact. True or false, there is nothing else which depends on it. But the
miracles of Christianity, and we might say the same of those of Judaism,
are the very hinge of the whole system. Setting aside the question whe-
ther they were performed or not, the belief of those miracles is, beyond
all doubt, one great principle or cause of its propagation. Deny the
story of Julian, and the main series of history goes on still as before.
Deny Christ’s miracles, and you have still to explain how the belief of
Christianity could be imposed on mankind: you have a chasm in history

very difficult to fill, but which must be filled, if you would assign any cause at all of events which have, and have had for ages, a most considerable influence on human affairs.

This point of view, I may add, seems to me so important, that though we were to concede the validity of the whole claim made by Gibbon for the strength and efficacy of those mere human causes to which he ascribes the propagation of Christianity, I do not perceive that the just evidence of the religion would be materially weakened by that concession. To a certain extent Gibbon's argument is, no doubt, valid. It explains *much*, and it does not greatly matter *how much*, of the method used to effect the establishment of the religion. But the *germ* of the religion it leaves wholly unaccounted for, except on the supposition of those original miracles of which it has been the business of this treatise to assert the performance. In truth, in the work of this eminent historian there is but little, *in the way of argument*, which we need distrust on the ground of its unfairness towards the Christian religion. The disgrace and the mischief of its offence against religion consists almost wholly in the moral contagion of that sarcastic impiety which pervades it, and which, though each drop makes but a feeble impression, is from mere repetition dangerous in the extreme, and will often have even on the philosophical mind an effect almost mechanical."—(pp. 253—255.)

Of the truth of these latter remarks, we are most fully persuaded. We have little doubt, that if the pages of Gibbon were to be entirely cleared of every thing like ironical and profane insinuation, and the 15th and 16th chapters were to be perused for the first time by a person, unsuspecting of the historian's infidelity, he might rise from the perusal as ignorant of that circumstance as he sat down. His impression might be, that he had met with a powerful statement of the secondary causes employed by Providence for the *propagation* of Christianity, without dreaming of an insidious design to disparage its divine original.

The Fourth Chapter exposes the unreasonableness of the demand which scepticism sometimes makes for more full and cogent miraculous evidence; and contains a very striking exposition of the consequences which probably might have resulted from a more general conviction among the Jews of our Saviour's resurrection and Messiahship. Had the whole nation been then won over to Christianity, it must have become identified with Judaism, and might, on that account, have been contemned universally throughout the heathen world. Besides, if, on our Saviour's resurrection, the Jews had become *friends*, we should have lost all that invaluable evidence for the miracles, derived from the knowledge that they were held to be undeniable, even by Jewish *adversaries and persecutors*. To these considerations Mr. Penrose adds, that an union of Jews and Christians at our Saviour's death, would hardly have prevented the rebellion of the whole nation against the Roman

yoke ; an enterprize which, whether successful or not, must have been highly discreditable to the Christian cause.

The rest of this chapter is employed in showing that the evidence of the Christian miracles is of a nature which leaves full scope for the exercise of our moral faculties. "The proof, though decisive, cannot be completed without a long and attentive derivative process." During this process, the bad passions may be secretly at work "to poison the welcome" of humiliating truth, while it is slowly winning its way into the mind : and the vigilance necessary to counteract and repress their influence may convert the inquiry into a trial of the heart as well as the understanding. And if it be objected, that the miracles could impose no moral probation on those who saw them performed, it may be replied, that the exercise of candour and fairness, at that time, consisted in making the inference, that the miracles were wrought, not by magic, or by dæmoniacal agency, but by the power of God : an inference, which, from the state of opinion in those days, was very far from being a matter of course. The whole of this discussion from page 278, to the end of chapter IV., deserves to be most attentively studied.

The Fifth Chapter we regard as an extremely important one. It tends to disencumber the subject of the Scripture miracles of a vast mass of extraneous matter, by establishing this position ;—that, in proving their truth, it is unnecessary to draw a strict line of distinction between true and false pretensions to miracles. We have here a principle highly valuable, as offering essential relief to many minds, which labour under the weight of questions connected with the whole history of ecclesiastical miracles. It is asserted by Middleton and Gibbon, that the claim of miracles has been equally confident in all ages of the church, from the first of the fathers, to the last of the popes. The assertion, whether false or true, was no doubt insidiously directed against the credit of the Scripture miracles themselves. But it may be very safely maintained, on the principles of Mr. Penrose, that their credit does not require the disproof of that assertion. In our inquiries respecting them, we need not suffer ourselves to be embarrassed for a moment, by disputes concerning the truth of any super-human occurrences alleged to have happened since. It may be difficult, indeed, to draw, before hand, a broad and vigorous line of demarcation, which shall obviously separate all true miracles from all fraudulent wonders. But yet, it may not be difficult to see, whether a particular fact is at a great distance, even from the most ill defined boundary, whether on the right side or the wrong. Now this, we contend, to be precisely the case with the miracles recorded in Scripture. They occupy a position of their own.

They do not stand near the border territory. They are quite clear of the debateable land. Let the evidence required for the establishment of a miracle be fixed at the very highest point warranted by the best authenticated cases in ecclesiastical history—still the wonderful works of Scripture will be found to stand on an elevation incomparably more commanding. They are far out of the reach of disturbance from any debate, which may arise in the regions below them, between the partisans and the adversaries of all other pretensions.

In this chapter the author is led to notice, with just disapprobation, the prejudice which is ready, almost without inquiry, to fix a mark of discredit on all miracles whatever, except those recorded in Scripture. There can be no doubt, that such claims to miraculous power should be scrutinized with the severest jealousy. But still, we are scarcely warranted to get rid of them all by one sweeping rejection, on the ground so commonly taken; namely, that frequent miracles would confound the order of nature, and disable us from pronouncing whether Moses or Jesus Christ had performed any thing which could invest them with supernatural authority. If miracles, indeed, were to hold divided empire with ordinary occurrences, they must, of course, soon lose their distinctive character. But it is difficult to imagine what confusion could arise from an almost perpetual current of preternatural agency, running constantly in some particular direction, through the wide regions of God's general Providence. Let us suppose, for instance, that the power of working miracles were at this day, undoubtedly and exclusively, attached to the teachers of Christianity. The most prodigal exercise of such power, by this one order of men, could never impair the force or the distinctness of that standing evidence. There can, therefore, be no ground for concluding that miracles have been discontinued, because, by their continuance, their efficacy would *necessarily* have been destroyed. See p. 297, &c.

The Sixth and last Chapter relates to the claims upon our attention, belonging to alleged miracles not recorded in Scripture. This inquiry, as we have already seen, is by no means necessary to the defence of Christianity. Nevertheless it is an inquiry of great interest and importance; and—it may be added—of formidable difficulty and complication, if pursued in all its details. Fortunately, however, there are some considerations by which it may be reduced within a moderate and manageable compass. The practical “question is, not whether we can put a general negative on all claims of miracles except those of Scripture, but whether those claims assume a shape, or a seriousness, which reasonably entitles them to regard and attention. Till cause be

shown, why any subject should be examined, we are authorized to *neglect*, even though we should be unprepared to *refute*, the particular evidence, or the facts alleged in it.”—(p. 305.) Why, for instance, should men waste their existence in weighing and measuring the vast mass of testimony, which has filled the world with the prodigies of witchcraft, or with veracious and delectable histories of apparitions? Why, even, should they be counting the grains of that scanty and precarious evidence which ascribes miraculous power to the truly pious missionary Xavier. Either the end, for which miracles are said to have been wrought, must be important, or the attestation to them must be weighty, before they can reasonably challenge our attention. If these presumptions are wanting, we may fairly relieve ourselves from the duty of any inquiry on the subject.

On the other hand, we must be watchful against a rash and hasty disregard of miraculous stories; for such precipitation may betray us into the pernicious sophistry of Hume; who certainly was guilty of an atrocious contempt of all good logic in affirming, that because many such accounts are false, none can be true. The proper corrective of this wretched fallacy is to be found in a note of Mr. Penrose, the substance of which may be stated thus. The *general* improbability of miracles is undoubtedly very great; but this improbability, great as it is, never can amount to a *certainly* that *all* miracles are, *without exception*, false. The *general* improbability that human testimony should be fallacious, may, perhaps, be slight: but this improbability is capable under some circumstances of being converted into a moral certainty, that, in a particular instance, the testimony is true. To argue from the general improbability of any class of occurrences, to the universal certainty of their falsehood, is, manifestly, illegitimate. But there is nothing illogical in proceeding, even from a considerable probability of their falsehood in ordinary cases, to the positive certainty of their truth in very extraordinary ones. We have here a distinction of immense importance. It looks very plausible to say, that miracles are highly improbable, while the deceitfulness of human testimony is notorious; and, on the strength of this vague and general comparison, to reject all accounts of supernatural agency. But the above considerations effectually un-muffle this precious sophism. They enable us to see, that there may be cases, in which the miracle is not improbable, while the testimony is absolutely conclusive. (See note A to p. 16.)

But we are compelled to bring our remarks to a close. We have dealt chiefly in commendation of this work, and have now left ourselves no room, even if there were any serious occasion for censure. We abstain from a useless notice of subordinate positions and statements, here and there, which might, perhaps, be

capable of improvement or limitation. We regard the work as a very valuable accession to English Theology, and could wish that its style were somewhat more popular, in order that it might have the fullest possible chance of general usefulness. Those readers who shrink from any serious demand on their patience and exertion, will, perhaps, on the first perusal of it, be apt to think that they have got hold of a very hard book. They certainly will have got hold of a book that requires a sustained application of their faculties: and it is possible that the author might, in some slight degree, have lightened their toil by a little more attention to the useful artifices of composition. But it must be remembered that the subject is a grave and severe one; and those persons can have no very vivid regard for truth, who are unwilling to do such treatises as this the justice of repeated perusal. It is no mean privilege to possess, within a reasonable compass, the result of laborious and independent thought, honestly devoted, for a series of years, to questions of the most sacred importance.

ART. IV.—*An Historical View of the Plea of Tradition, as maintained in the Church of Rome, &c. &c.* By George Miller, D.D. &c. &c. 8vo. 4s. London. Rivington.

AMONG the defenders of the pure Christian Religion, whose exertions have been called forth by renewed attempts of Popery against the Protestant Church in these countries, we are happy to number the able and learned Doctor MILLER. The various literary works, by which this eminent man has benefited society, bear so clearly the stamp of genius; his historical lectures, particularly, contain so much useful information, and interesting novelty of thought; and his "Observations" lately published, "on the Doctrines of Christianity, in reference to Arianism, and on the Athanasian Creed," are so excellent, that we opened his last publication, which now lies before us, with confident anticipations of its value. Our expectation has been realized.

Our space must confine us to a brief and general description of the nature of the contents of Doctor MILLER's publication. We refer our readers for more particular information to the valuable tract itself. The author, following a course, novel in the revived controversy with the Romish Church, proposes "to examine *as a question of history*, the tradition alleged by the Church of Rome in support of its peculiar tenets, to investigate the opinions of those ecclesiastical writers, from age to age, who have been referred to in the controversy, and thus to trace the history of the plea." (p. 1, 2.) The immediate occasion of Doctor Miller's publica-

tion was furnished by a resolution which certain Roman Catholics adopted in a meeting at Carlow in the last Summer, and by an exhortation, which Dr. Doyle, titular bishop of Kildare and Leighlin, subsequently addressed to the Romish Clergy of Carlow and its vicinity. The purport of the Resolution, and of Dr. Doyle's exhortation, "has," (says our author,) "been, not simply to assert that the revelation of our Saviour has been transmitted to us, partly by the sacred Scriptures, and partly by tradition; and that therefore it is not sufficient for a Christian to seek in the Scriptures a knowledge of his religion; but to represent tradition as the indispensable interpreter of those Scriptures, and as giving authority to the meaning which it shall pronounce to be true."

The result of Dr. Miller's examination of the history of the plea of tradition, for the details of which we must refer to his work, is summed up by him in the following words:

"Such appears to have been the history of that tradition, which is now maintained by Roman Catholics in Ireland, as indispensably necessary to the just interpretation of the sacred writings. Apparently unknown to the Apostolic Fathers, who might naturally be supposed to have been inclined to announce their possession of a deposit so important to the Church, and so creditable to themselves; it is discovered, first, among the *gnostic* heretics, who in the affectation of a superior knowledge of divine things had corrupted the simplicity of the Gospel with many inventions, which required some other sanction than the authority of the Scriptures. It was then adopted from *them* by two fathers of the Church (Irenæus and Tertullian;) but only to repel the arguments of those who had first pleaded against the Scriptures a spurious tradition, and had then so falsified the records of Christianity, as to embarrass any inference from their genuine communications. When this use had been made of the argument, it seems to have been felt that such an appeal was incongruous and unnecessary, for it was immediately abandoned by the Church, nor does it appear to have been resumed in the great controversy of *Arianism* by either party for the support of their tenets. After an interruption of almost two centuries and a half among the western Christians, and in Greece of the much longer period of more than five centuries and a half; we again find tradition pleaded as an authority; but in each case for a *practice*, not for a *doctrine*; each practice, also, plainly condemned by the written word. The argument was then abandoned, and each plea disowned by one of the two Churches, until the very crisis of the reformation, when it was once more brought forward, to oppose the appeal which the reformers had made to the Scriptures; and as these reformers had objected to doctrines, not less than to practices, the tradition of the Church was then, for the first time,* pleaded in favour of doctrines.

* Dr. Miller of course means, for the first time with the authority of the Church: for some individuals, (*Scotus* among them) had attempted to defend certain new points of faith, as declared by the Lateran Council, by the aid of alleged tradition; "and thus," says Stillingfleet, "*Scotus* helped himself out in the dark point of transubstantiation."

Even then, however, in the very agony of the papal power, it was not pleaded that the Scripture was not intelligible without the aid of tradition, the latter being represented only as entitled to equal reverence, and not as a superior and controlling authority for divine truth. This last step was taken about the close of the sixteenth century, by Cardinal *Bellarmino*, who in his too candid defence of the Church of Rome, did not hesitate to maintain, that the gospel, without unwritten tradition, is an empty name, or words without sense. The Roman Catholics of Ireland, imitating the boldness of the Cardinal, have declared, that the Scriptures are not intelligible without the aid of tradition." (p. 65, 67.)

Though some of the facts here stated, have been adverted to by Stillingleet, Ellys, and others, in a former period of the controversy; and that relating to Cardinal *Bellarmino* has been well dwelt on by Bishop Marsh, in his "Comparative View;" (p. 15, 16.) yet, the history possesses much novelty and interest; and is, perhaps, the only regular historic view of the subject, which we have. We thank Dr. Miller for this his new service; and recommend his book to the attention of the public. We feel no small degree of pleasure in expressing gratitude to this distinguished Divine, for his zealous and able exertions.

Dr. Miller's appendix to his "Historical View of the Plea of Tradition" contains interesting extracts from original authorities.

ART. V.—1. *A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Derby, at the Visitations at Derby and Chesterfield, June 22 and 23, 1825; and published at their request.* By the Rev. S. Butler, D.D. F.R.S. &c. Archdeacon of Derby, and Head Master of Shrewsbury School. London, Longman & Co. 1826.

2. *A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Derby, at the Visitations at Derby and Chesterfield, June 15, and 16, 1826; and published at their request.* By the Rev. S. Butler, D.D. F.R.S. &c. Archdeacon of Derby, and Head Master of Shrewsbury School. London, Longman & Co. 1826.

THE information comprised in the first of these charges is so shortly and clearly stated, and may prove so highly useful as a pattern for others to follow, and as part of a general survey of the present state of our Church Establishment, that we transcribe it entire from the Archdeacon's pages.

"The Archdeaconry of Derby is, as you know, commensurate with the county, and divided into three deaneries, Derby, Ashbourne, and Chesterfield. There are, however, about thirty churches, which, being either peculiar or donative, are not under archidiaconal jurisdiction. The greatest part of these lie in the north-western side of the county, from about Bakewell, towards Buxton and Ashbourne.

"Of the remainder, being 163 parishes, there are, in the deanery of Derby, 91; in that of Ashbourne, 21; and in that of Chesterfield, 51 churches.

"These are divided into rectories, vicarages, or chapels and curacies.

"Of these there are in the deanery of Derby	27 rectories,
	30 vicarages,
	34 curacies.

91

"In that of Ashbourne	9 rectories,
	3 vicarages,
	9 curacies.

21

"In that of Chesterfield	16 rectories,
	19 vicarages,
	16 curacies.

51

"In all	52 rectories,
	52 vicarages,
	59 curacies and chapels.

163

"There are also three or four small chapels on some parochial townships within the archdeaconry, which, being served only once a fortnight, or even less frequently, by the incumbent, or curate of the mother church, and not being entered in the process paper, I have not taken into the present account.

"The whole income of these 163 churches, according to the returns I have received, and which I believe are tolerably correct, being divided by the whole number of churches, gives an income of 239*l.* for each, omitting fractions of pence and shillings;—but as four of the churches are consolidated, their number is reduced in fact to 159, instead of 163; and thus the average income of each church is raised to very near 245*l.*; a sum which may be considered as not much differing from the average value of churches throughout the kingdom.

“Of these 159 livings, for so many we must call them, for the reason I have already assigned, there are

23	of or above the value of 500 <i>l</i> .	
10	from 400 <i>l</i> . to	500
15	— 300	400
19	— 200	300
12	— 150	200
31	— 100	150
30	— 50	100
19	not exceeding	50

159

“Of these, 58 are above the average of 245*l*., and 101 below it. The tithes of 90 churches, being considerably more than one-half the number in the archdeaconry, are in the hands of lay impropriators;— and those of 18 more, though in ecclesiastical hands, are not in those of the incumbent of the church to which they belong.

“These 159 livings, comprising 163 churches, are served by 135 clergymen, either as incumbents or curates: For 28 churches, being for the most part chapels of ease, are served by the incumbent or curate of the mother church, or by the minister of a neighbouring parish.

“Of the above 163 churches, 91 have houses fit for the residence of a clergyman; 20 have houses, but unfit for the residence of a clergyman; and, indeed, nearly all these last-mentioned are mere cottages, just capable of accommodating a labourer and his family; and 52 have no house. So that, in fact, there are 72 churches which virtually have no place of residence for their minister.

“On the 91 livings which have houses, there are resident 60 incumbents, and 21 curates. In the remaining 10 cases, in which neither incumbent nor curate appear resident, the incumbent, generally, is so virtually; either living in his own house in the parish, instead of the parsonage, and doing himself the duty, or residing on an adjoining living, and doing also the duty of that on which he does not reside.

“Of the 20 livings which have no fit houses, and the 52 which have no house at all, many are of small value; and being themselves insufficient for the support of a clergyman, and of small population, requiring only single duty, are served by the curate or incumbent of a neighbouring parish. There are, however, 5 of these which have their incumbent, and 5 which have their curate resident in the parish; and of the remaining 62, the duty, in 39 cases, is performed by the incumbent himself.

“There were educated, in schools connected with the church establishment, at the time my survey was completed, 11,759 children; but owing, I hope in some degree to my own previous recommendations, and no doubt much more to the zeal and earnestness with which our able and excellent diocesan has taken up the subject during his last year's visitation, I trust this number, large as it appears, is now considerably augmented.

"At the time of my own survey there were 29 parishes, containing 14,000 inhabitants, without any school whatever.

"I cannot but press this, my Reverend Brethren, most seriously upon your attention. In an age of all others the most experimental, and, I may add, the most impatient of moral and religious restraint and discipline, it is of the utmost importance, if possible, to stem the torrent of infidelity and licentiousness, by giving a right direction to the minds of the rising generation, and making those early impressions in favour of genuine and practical religion, which are, of all others, the most likely to be permanent."—*First Charge*, p. 1—9.

The second charge refers to a much more difficult and delicate question,—the extent to which the education of the lower orders may be advantageously and safely carried. Archdeacon Butler describes the possible dangers of the experiment with his usual ability, and perhaps he overrates them; but the corrective suggested in the following admirable passage places the question in its proper light.

"I am aware that the example of our northern fellow-subjects may be, and often is alleged, as a proof of the advantages of diffused education, and far be it from me to undervalue or depreciate their merits. But I must be allowed to observe, that if they are distinguished for sobriety, quietness, and industry in time of peace; and, let me add, for courage and discipline in time of war; the cause is not so much to be looked for in the diffusion of general knowledge, as in the general attention which is paid in that country to religious education. This is the great and essential cause of their national civilization, and this is the point, my Reverend Brethren, to which I anxiously wish to draw your attention. If education is to be diffused as widely as possible, let it be *thus* directed, and it cannot fail to produce good effects. But if it is *not* thus regulated, and much more, if it is *entirely withdrawn* from this great object, to philosophical dogmas or abstract speculations, we cannot expect that it will produce substantial good. With this object in view, it will make men better citizens, better neighbours, better parents, better husbands, better friends. It will teach them to be sober, diligent, patient and content. It will give them not only clearer views of their duties, but nobler motives to fulfil them. It will not only enlighten their understandings, but purify their hearts. This is knowledge which cannot be too widely spread; this must produce happiness to all; to those who give, to those who receive, and to those who practise it. This takes no man from his proper sphere, interferes with no useful calling, occupies none in frivolous speculations, or unnecessary pursuits—administers to no folly—creates no discontent. This, then, my Brethren, is what I most earnestly recommend to your attention. That you, who, as pastors of the flocks committed to your care, are required to see that none be lost, be diligent especially to train up the rising generation in the fear of God, and the knowledge of their Christian duties.

“The advocates of general education say, that the spirit is gone forth, and who shall stop it? Who, my Brethren, would seek to stop it, while it is not productive of harm, or can be made productive of good? Who would seek to stop it, while it is merely directed even to purposes of rational instruction or amusement? Considered as an experiment for these purposes, no one can wish it ill. But experiments in uncautious hands are never free from hazard, and, in other sciences besides that of medicine, are often fraught with the most perilous consequences. They may be undertaken by the ignorant or unwary, but the remedy for the mischief they occasion is often beyond the skill of the experienced and the wise. They are like the letting out of water, which is not always safe or salutary: if it is directed in its proper channels, it may nourish the plants, and make the earth bring forth abundantly; if it is suffered to flow without restraint, where it ought to refresh and invigorate, it may inundate and destroy. Be it our part, then, my Reverend Brethren, as far as we can, to direct its course; and if the spirit of learning has gone forth irresistibly into the world, let us avail ourselves of it for the best and holiest purposes. Let us recollect, as I observed on a former occasion, that as long as we have an established national Church, no education but that which is in conformity with its liturgy and doctrines can be strictly national. Let us remember that we are the appointed teachers in that Church, and let us endeavour to be at least as faithful in *our* office, as the ministers of other congregations, which dissent from us, are in *theirs*. I do not mean that we should seek to make converts and proselytes, or interfere with the religious instruction which men of other persuasions give their children, but that we should endeavour to keep those who *do* belong to us, steadfast in *their* faith, by giving them such early lessons of piety, and such instructive explanations of what the Gospel requires them to believe and do, as may remain with them through their lives.

“Above all, my Brethren, while we form their tender minds, and inculcate precept upon precept, and line upon line, let us not only be careful to do this with all diligence and all patience; but let us inforce our instructions and sanctify our precepts by our own example; thus, and thus only, may we hope to succeed in our endeavours. If we thus sow the seed of religious knowledge in the youthful mind, and thus water it, God will give the increase; with his blessing we shall reap the fruits, and our own labour will not have been in vain in the Lord.”

ART. VI.—*Boast not thyself of to-morrow: a Sermon, preached at Middle Claydon Church, at the Funeral of General Sir Harry Calvert, Bart. G.C.B. and Lieutenant-Governor of Chelsea Hospital, who died at Claydon House, Bucks, after an illness of eight hours, Sept. 4, 1826.* By the Rev. Henry Blunt, A.M. Vicar of Clare, Suffolk; Curate of Chelsea, Middlesex; alternate Evening Preacher at the Philanthropic Society; and late Fellow of Pembroke College, Cambridge. 8vo. 1s. London. John Hatchard and Son. 1826.

WE extract what appears to us the most important passage in this discourse.

“ When I say that I trust our dear departed friend was prepared, you have a right to ask me why I venture such an assertion; this is not the place and not the time to make light assertions upon a subject so solemn and important. I will then tell you why I say so; it is not because I believe him, as I most assuredly do, to have been a man of the *most perfect integrity* and the *most inflexible uprightness and consciousness*, in all the duties between man and man, *blameless*; it is not because I have known him minister largely to the wants of others, and sympathize most deeply and most feelingly with them in their distress; it is not because I have myself seen, since this sad event has happened, the tears gush from the widow's eyes, and have beheld the sorrows of the poor whom his Christian kindness had deeply and dearly attached to him; it is not because we may without one grain of flattery, and without one word of exaggerated praise, say of him, as was said of Job, “ When the ear heard him, then it blessed him, when the eye saw him, then it gave witness to him; because he delivered the poor that cried, and the fatherless and him that had none to help him. The blessing of him that was *ready to perish* came upon him, and he caused the widow's heart to sing for joy.” These are features in the character of him for whom we mourn, to which we may look back with feelings of melancholy pleasure, and to which, I confess, I do advert with sensations of sincere delight; but it is not for any, or for all of these, that I would speak of him as of one prepared to meet his God: no! highly as I respect and value and love charities and virtues such as these, I dare not magnify them thus: I dare not say that they could ever qualify a sinful, fallen creature, such as man, even in his best estate, to stand acquitted in the presence of a perfectly pure and holy God: no, my brethren, our noblest charities, our holiest deeds are mingled with sin; instead of forming a plea for mercy, they themselves need repenting of, they themselves require washing in the blood of Christ to render them even acceptable to God. When I say I trust he was prepared for this awful, this unexpected summons, I ground it upon the firm belief that he had fled for refuge to the hope set before him in the gospel, that he had been brought to the vital knowledge of himself as a sinner, and of Jesus Christ as his only Saviour and Deliverer: that he had cast off every

dependence upon himself, and had come in sincere repentance and deep consciousness of his sins, and of his need of a free and full forgiveness, to the cross of his Redeemer. This, and this alone, is the ground of my assertion; all the virtues and all the charities of life are nothing in the sight of God, except they are the fruits of a true and living faith, except they proceed from a heart renewed by the spirit of grace, and truly reconciled to God by the death of his Son. And even then, valuable and *absolutely necessary* as they are, as evidences of our belief, it is not to them that we look for our acquittal, our acceptance with God; it is to the blood of the everlasting covenant, and to that alone. It is this lively interest in the blood of the Redeemer, this "being one with Christ and Christ with us," which alone can give a man peace at the last, and enable us to be "presented faultless in the presence of His glory with exceeding joy."—p. 13—16.

There are several objections to this passage. Mr. Blunt proposes to tell us why he trusts that the highly respected person, at whose funeral this discourse was delivered, was prepared to meet his God. And from all that we had known or heard of the late Sir Harry Calvert, we should have imagined, that the preacher had undertaken a very easy task. Sir Harry Calvert passed a long life in the serious, open profession of the Christian faith; he was a constant attendant at public worship, and a regular partaker of the appointed means of grace. His actions were not inconsistent with his profession. In private he was a kind and faithful friend, a tender and vigilant parent, and was remarkable for purity of morals, and strict sobriety of conduct. His official services are known throughout the country; and were never spoken of without praise. He was the unwearied promoter of every thing which could improve the religious and moral character of his fellow-soldiers, and his labours were crowned with no inconsiderable portion of success, because they were temperate, and wise.

Might we not, therefore, have expected to be told concerning such a man, that his truly Christian conduct established the reality of his Christian character: that his faith was proved by his works; and that, as far as mortals could see or know, he lived a sincere, and died a happy disciple of his Saviour? Mr. Blunt expresses himself in very different language. He mentions the virtues of the deceased, in terms which are theoretically correct; and which it would have been quite proper to address to the living man, if he was supposed to rely upon his works; or to his mourning relations, if they were understood to think that he was entitled to the joys of heaven as a reward. But these points were not under consideration. The preacher was stating his own reason for trusting that a departed friend was blessed; and he grounds it upon a firm belief "that he had been brought to a

vital knowledge of himself as a sinner, and of Jesus Christ as his only Saviour and deliverer; that he had cast off every dependence upon himself, and had come in sincere repentance, and deep consciousness of his sins, and of his need of a free and full forgiveness, to the cross of his Redeemer. This, and this alone, is the ground of my assertion." And this might be said as truly of a mere death-bed penitent, as of one who had proved the sincerity of his repentance, by a long course of holy living. We admit, that if the sentiments so justly attributed to this individual, were not entertained by him, his religion was nothing worth; but they might have been entertained by him without rendering his condition secure; and Mr. Blunt's belief that they were entertained, must rest at last upon those very facts which he refuses to take into consideration. Works, he confesses, are "*absolutely necessary as evidences of our belief*;" and yet when inquiring into the reality of a man's belief, he sets these evidences aside, and refers us to his own private conviction that the deceased was a true Christian. There is a strange inconsistency in this mode of reasoning; and we are sorry to see it adopted by so respectable and zealous a preacher as Mr. Blunt.

ART. VII.—*A Popular Introduction to the Study of the Holy Scriptures, for the Use of English Readers.* By William Carpenter. Illustrated with Maps and Plates. 8vo. 16s. London. 1826.

OUR attention has been directed to this volume with some degree of curiosity, in consequence of the assiduity with which it has been advertised in different periodical journals for the last two or three months, with a declaration "that it will not interfere with any existing work." We were not aware of "any existing work," to which the compiler of the volume now under consideration could allude, except the Bishop of Winchester's "Introduction to the Study of the Bible," and Mr. HARTWELL HORNE'S "Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures." The former is an admirable manual, comprising almost every thing which "English Readers" could require; and at the same time containing the result of so much learned research, that the scholar may with pleasure recur to it, to revive his recollections. But this manual Mr. Carpenter does not appear to have seen. On comparing his book, however, with Mr. Horne's work, the mystery was solved at sight: for so close is the resemblance between these publications, that the two Sosias

(with whose feats the daily journals have told us the public has been so highly diverted) are not more alike than is Mr. Carpenter's book to Mr. Horne's Introduction, in the mode of printing, the *arrangement* of a considerable part of the work, the identity of references to English authors, and the exhibition of the same quotations from the same authors, (in one or two instances with Mr. Horne's *numeration of paragraphs*,) and in the same order and for the same purpose with which Mr. Horne has given them. On a more minute collation, suspicion was converted into certainty; and our deliberate conviction is, that the book which bears the name of Mr. Carpenter, is as artful a piece of plagiarism, as it ever fell to the lot of a critic to expose; and of plagiarism not exclusively confined to Mr. Horne (though the second, third, and fourth volumes of his Introduction are principally concerned :) for we have detected passages ostensibly given as direct quotations from English authors, which, we are pretty certain, from actual comparison, have been taken at second hand (if we may use such an expression) from OTHER writers who have given the *same* quotation, the *same* reference, and on the same subject; but with this difference, that the writers alluded to have printed their quotations *bonâ fide* as such, with quotation commas; while Mr. Carpenter has appropriated the passages in question to himself, without indicating in any way their beginning, conclusion, or extent, and in some instances without any reference to the pages which he professes to quote. We will now state some of the evidence which has led us to this conclusion, and our readers shall judge for themselves.

The first part of Mr. Carpenter's book contains directions for reading the Holy Scriptures: and in almost the first page of his Preface, he has taken, with one alteration, the title of Mr. Horne's observations on the same subject. The commencement of Mr. Horne's Introduction (first edition, or the last chapter of Vol. I. of subsequent impressions,) is "On the MORAL QUALIFICATIONS for studying THE SCRIPTURES." This Mr. Carpenter entitles "THE MORAL QUALIFICATIONS FOR a profitable reading of THE SCRIPTURES." It was stumbling upon this coincidence, at the very outset, that excited our suspicions: and the further we proceeded, those suspicions were progressively confirmed.

The second chapter of Mr. Carpenter's first part comprises rules for reading the Holy Scriptures; in which, besides the literal sense, we have the scope, context, parallel passages, analogy of faith, and practical reading, severally discussed. Mr. Horne has chapters on the same subject, though differently arranged: and here Mr. Carpenter, in one or two instances, quotes Mr. Horne for some matter which was no where else extant; but for-

gets to express his acknowledgments to him for two second-hand quotations, one from Bishop Horsley, and the other from a discourse by Mr. H. T. Burder. The extract from Bishop Horsley occurs in Mr. Horne's chapter on *parallel passages*, and he refers to his "Nine Sermons on the Resurrection, &c. pp. 221—228." Mr. Carpenter omits one sentence, and also a few dots which Mr. Horne had given to show that he had omitted some sentences; and Mr. Carpenter has printed, as *one entire quotation*, what Mr. Horne had, by quotation commas, distinguished as taken from *several pages* of Bishop Horsley, even to a little dash — which is not in the Bishop's volume: and Mr. C. cites *Nine Sermons*, p. 121, &c. Now, we have taken the trouble to compare Mr. Horne with the third edition of the Bishop's Sermons, and we find that his reference *is correct*: and it is evident, that Mr. C. did not consult the book in question, from the vague reference he has made to the title, and from his referring to "*p. 121, &c.*" where the passage he pretends to cite is *not* to be found: for that passage is the commencement of Bishop Horsley's Four Sermons on the Evidence of our Lord's Resurrection. So again, in the extract alluded to, from Mr. Burder, Mr. Carpenter gives the *same* quotation on the *same subject* as Mr. H. had done, and then gravely tells us, "since the above was written, I have met with the following judicious remarks, of which I gladly avail myself," &c. &c., when the very passage was before him, at the time he copied from Mr. Horne this sentence, (to his very italics,)—"The scope of an author is either *general* or *special*."! Can any one believe that such a coincidence is purely accidental? especially when we add that Professor Franck's Guide to the Study of the Holy Scriptures, to which Mr. Carpenter professes to refer, *has no such sentence*. But we hasten to more important instances.

Part II. of Mr. Carpenter's volume treats on what he calls "Helps towards a right Understanding of Scripture." On the nature and sources of those "helps" he has many things in common with Mr. Horne, which show most clearly that the Introduction was before him when he wrote: for we find him introducing the *same* quotation from an old author, and upon the *same subject*:—Though he refers to a different edition, he is evidently indebted to Mr. H. for the authority. In one instance he takes a long paragraph (nearly an entire page) for which he refers to Mr. Horne's fourth edition, but gives no quotation commas to mark the extent of his obligation; and *after* he has given his reference, he, without acknowledgment, takes from a subsequent page the names of certain authors, whose works Mr. H. had indicated as worthy of perusal. But it is in the "Prefatory Ob-

servations on the several Books of Scripture," that we find the sweeping use that has been made of Mr. H.'s labours. He disposes his prefatory observations on the several books of Scripture, as any of our readers may see on referring to the contents of his fourth volume under the heads of *Author, date, genuineness, and authenticity—occasion, scope or design* (he uses these words indifferently), and *analysis of its contents*. No other English writer exactly pursues this order, but the foreign authors whom Mr. H. has consulted *do follow it*; and so does Mr. Carpenter, without acknowledgment: for he tells his readers (p. 57) that he proceeds "to notice in order the several books of the Scriptures, and to furnish such information respecting their *authors—dates—titles—scope or design—authenticity and contents* as is requisite for attaining a proper knowledge of the respective matters treated of in them."

Scarcely a page occurs, in this portion of Mr. Carpenter's book in which we have not found several lines taken verbatim, in some instances to Mr. Horne's very italics: and in one instance, Mr. Horne's *peculiar* order of arranging the prophetic books is taken without any acknowledgment! Mr. H. divides the prophets into three classes, viz. "The Prophets who flourished before the *Babylonian* captivity"—"The Prophets who flourished near to and during the *Babylonian* captivity;" and "the Prophets who flourished after the return of the Jews from *Babylon*;" and he treats "on the Book of the Prophet *Jonah*," Amos, &c. &c. (vol. iv. pp. 147—211 of the fourth edition, or vol. ii. pp. 237—320 of the first edition.) Our readers shall now see how closely Mr. Carpenter has imitated Mr. Horne's order, in pp. 108 to 134. "I. Prophets who flourished PRIOR TO the *Babylonish* captivity." "II. Prophets who flourished near to and during the *Babylonish* captivity;" and "III. Prophets who flourished after the return from *Babylon*." Our readers will here observe that Mr. Carpenter has altered *BABYLONIAN* into *BABYLONISH*, and has substituted "prior to" for "before." We should not have dwelt on this seemingly trifling circumstance; but that we do not remember to have seen the prophets so arranged by any English writer. The only English authors whom Mr. Carpenter professes to cite: viz. Dr. Gray, Dr. A. Clarke, Dr. Gill, and Bishop Tomline, (whose *Elements of Theology* we suspect he cites at second hand from Mr. Horne,) have *no such order*. The truth is, that no English writer has so arranged the prophets before Mr. H. whose order Mr. C. has taken for *nearly thirty closely printed pages*, without any indication of the source to which he is indebted for his method.

We now come to direct instances of passages palpably taken

from Mr. Horne and other writers, without acknowledgment. In vol. iv. p. 11. Mr. Horne has enumerated the types of the Messiah; Mr. Carpenter also presents several "types of the Messiah," giving the same identical types, the same references, the same italics, the same semicolons. He has added, indeed, the word *tabernacled*, as being the English of the Greek word of St. John, which was referred to by Mr. H. But with the exception of this single word, the passage is from Mr. Horne without acknowledgment, and without considering whether all the subjects so indicated as types were really typical of the Messiah. The tabernacle is clearly no type of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; St. John's language only alluded to it. Mr. Horne, in his fifth edition, has very properly expunged this; but Mr. Carpenter has copied Mr. H.'s fourth edition verbatim et punctuatum, without stopping to consider whether every thing there stated was strictly applicable. The introductory remark on the title of Deuteronomy is palpably altered from Mr. Horne, the heads of part of whose analysis of that book are taken. We also recognize from Mr. Horne whole sentences interwoven in Mr. Carpenter's prefaces to the several books of Joshua, Judges, Kings, Chronicles, and Job. On the book of Psalms we find Mr. C. copying part of Mr. Horne's quotation from Bishop Horsley, On the *Structure of the Psalms*, and with the very same reference "Bp. Horsley's Psalms, vol. i. p. xvi."! On the book of Ecclesiastes Mr. Carpenter affects to quote (but without quotation commas) Mr. Holden's learned and well executed "Attempt to illustrate the Book of Ecclesiastes," "Prelim. Discourse, p. lxxv." for what is NOT there. In vol. iv. p. 192, Mr. Horne, having given with *quotation commas* an extract from Mr. Holden's work, cites *correctly* "Prelim. Diss. pp. lxxv. lxxviii—lxxii:" and the whole of Mr. Carpenter's Synopsis of Ecclesiastes is substantially the same as in Mr. Horne's volume; only Mr. C. has run together the subjects of the several sections; and the titles or subjects of the two parts which Mr. Horne has printed in small capital letters, Mr. Carpenter has printed in italics. We should not have mentioned these particulars; but the fact is, that these titles, (*which are found in Mr. Horne's work*;) viz.

"PART I. The Vanity of all earthly Conditions, Occupations, and Pleasures.

"PART II. The Nature, Excellence, and beneficial Effects of Wisdom or Religion."—

These titles, we repeat, do NOT exist in Mr. Holden's *Analytical Table of Contents*, NOR in his *paraphrase*. He mentions them, indeed, in his Preliminary Dissertation. Mr. Horne has supplied them in his work; whence Mr. Carpenter has mutilated Mr.

Horne's Analysis, copying however all the *parentheses* in which he had inclosed the references to the book of Ecclesiastes, and which parentheses do not exist in Mr. Holden's Book. But we must leave Mr. Horne a little, to point out Mr. Carpenter's obligations to another author, who has distinguished himself by the scrupulous fidelity with which he has indicated passages *bonâ fide* cited by him—we mean Dr. ADAM CLARKE.

In the preface to his commentary on Isaiah, (p. v.) he thus expresses himself:

"On the style of the prophets much has been said by several learned men, particularly, Calmet, Lowth, Bishop Newton, Vitringa, Michaelis, Houbigant. Their chief observations, and especially those most within the reach of the common people, have been selected and abridged with great care and industry by the Rev. Dr. John Smith, of Cambleton, in his little tract intituled "A Summary View and Explanation of the Writings of the Prophets," to which it forms preliminary observations."

We will now give Mr. Carpenter's observations on this topic, requesting our readers to compare the words, which, in both extracts, we have printed in italics.

"On the style of the prophets much has been written, particularly by Calmet, Lowth, Vitringa, Michaelis, and Newton. From the preliminary observations to Dr. Smith's "View of the Prophets," &c. where the principal observations of these learned writers have been abridged with great judgment, the following remarks have been selected. (p. 95.)

The coincidence in these two passages is too obvious to need any remark: we will only add, that Dr. Clarke has given Dr. Smith's quotations, with the accustomed marks, to show the extent of *his* obligations: and that Mr. Carpenter has given the same passages from Dr. Smith, amounting to some eighteen or twenty pages, but without any mark to indicate the beginning, conclusion, or extent of his quotation. He found the passage cited by Dr. Clarke; he takes Dr. C.'s introductory remarks, *as his own*, and, guided by the Doctor's research, he goes to the same source and gives the same passage from the same or some other edition of Dr. Smith's book. But this is not the only instance in which Mr. Carpenter has been indebted to Dr. Clarke without acknowledgment. His analysis of the prophecy of Isaiah, according to Vitringa, in p. 114, is taken from the Doctor's Preface already alluded to, with a few alterations. Before we quit Isaiah, we must remark, that in noticing the style of that Prophet, Mr. C. (p. 113) has taken an entire paragraph verbatim from Mr. Horne's 4th volume, p. 165, without any quotation marks; which he has blended with two pages taken, also verbatim, from Dr. Gray's "Key," to which he refers with "*p. 368, &c.*" but without indicating how much he owes to that learned Divine. Mr. Horne's arrangement of the prophecies of Jere-

miah, after Dr. Blayney, is copied verbatim with his introductory and concluding remarks.

But we must hasten to the New Testament. In p. 142 we find Mr. Carpenter introducing a long extract from Bishop Marsh's translation of Michaelis, (Vol. III. Part I. pp. 40—85,) with some remarks, ostensibly his own, but almost verbatim from Dr. Clarke. We will first give the Dr.'s words.

"The following harmonized Table of Contents of the four Gospels I have borrowed from Professor Michaelis, Introduction to the New Testament, by Dr. Marsh, vol. iii. p. 40, &c., and think it will be of use to the reader in pointing out where the same transaction is mentioned by the evangelists; what they have in common, and what is peculiar to each. The arrangement of facts, as they occur in St. Matthew is here generally followed; and the other evangelists collated with his account." (Comment on four Gospels, signature 4 T. last page.)

Mr. Carpenter, p. 142, expresses himself thus:—

"The following harmonised table of contents of the four Gospels will be found serviceable to the reader, in pointing out where the same transaction is mentioned by the different evangelists. It is taken from Marsh's Translation of Michaelis, "Introduction to the New Testament, vol. iii. p. 40, &c." (We request our readers to note this identity of reference.) "The arrangement of facts as they occur in St. Matthew is here generally followed; and the other evangelists are collated with his account." (p. 142.)

Mr. Carpenter then introduces a short paragraph from Michaelis, which Dr. Clarke has not, and terminates his remarks with the following sentence, which is from Dr. Clarke, with one or two verbal alterations.

"The numbers prefixed to the several sections, point out the consecutive order of the facts, as well as they can be ascertained." (p. 142.)

"The consecutive facts are numbered as nearly as possible, in the supposed chronological order of their occurrence." (Clarke, ut supra.)

The harmonized table of Michaelis then follows. Dr. Clarke has introduced the notes which are in Part II. of Bishop Marsh's translation, at the foot of the page, and has added some short but valuable remarks of his own. Mr. Carpenter also gives the notes of Bishop Marsh at the foot of his page, in the same way that Dr. Clarke has done; thus leading us to suspect that he sent the commentary of the latter to the printer instead of transcribing Michaelis.

In pages 182 to 194 Mr. Carpenter has taken only thirteen closely printed pages, which he calls "An analysis of the four Gospels," from Mr. Townsend's arrangement of the New Testament, (vol. ii. pp. 740 to 753,) with one of his very modest etceras—"Vol. ii. p. 741, &c."

With regard to the Books of the New Testament, (to omit many short unacknowledged passages,) we have to remark, that

some parts of Mr. Horne's observations on the Gospel of St. Matthew are taken verbatim, to his very references; that his account of the tenets of the heresiarch Cerinthus, in vol. iv. pp. 293, 294, is copied by Mr. Carpenter (p. 175), verbatim, to his very *italics*; and that his analysis of the Gospel of St. John, in the following pages, including his reference to Rosenmüller, whose scholia Mr. Carpenter evidently did not consult, is also copied verbatim, as well as his analysis of the same apostle's first epistle, and the very useful canons for interpreting the Apocalypse, which Mr. Horne has abridged in *his own language* from Dr. Woodhouse's translation (now very rare) of that mysterious prophecy, to which work Mr. Horne has correctly referred, but which Mr. Carpenter, as usual, has cited with an &c.

The last portion of Mr. Carpenter's volume treats on biblical antiquities: and here he has made so much use of Mr. Horne's peculiar arrangement, that for *many pages together* the head lines (as we believe they are termed) are identically the same... e. g. *Criminal Law—Military Affairs—Feast of Tabernacles*, &c. &c. &c. Mr. Horne's third volume is wholly devoted to biblical antiquities: it opens with a *sketch* of the historical and physical *geography* of the *Holy Land*; Mr. Carpenter, too, favours us with a *sketch* of *sacred geography*, and in his minor arrangements he pursues Mr. Horne's method of treating the subject. He tells us in a note, that he has adopted, with some slight alterations, the plan laid down by Reland in his *Palestina Illustrata*; availing himself of the materials furnished by the most authentic and recent travellers, concerning the present state of the Holy Land. We doubt this assertion. Not a few of his statements are indeed taken from "The Modern Traveller," a well compiled little work, but we are sure that he did *not* consult the laborious and generally accurate Reland, when he drew up his account of the mountains of Palestine. Reland treats them in this order: Lebanon, Hermon, Carmel, Tabor, Mount of Olives, the mountains of Gilcad, Bashan, and other smaller mountains. Mr. Horne also professes to have consulted Reland and the modern travellers. His order is this: *Lebanon*, including Hermon (which recent travellers have shown to be part of the range of Lebanon), Carmel, Tabor, the Mountains of Israel, Gilead, Abarrin, Pisgah, and Nebo. *He* has clearly had Reland before him, and followed his order where it was correct; and how minutely he has compared and digested the narratives of modern travellers any of our readers may judge, who will turn to his Sketch, which is drawn up almost with the precision of an eye witness. Mr. Horne's order, and not seldom, the chief part of his descriptions of the mountains is taken verbatim by Mr. Carpenter; for thus runs *his* enumeration: 1. Lebanon; 2. Carmel; 3. Tabor; 4. The Moun-

tains of Israel or Ephraim; 5. The Mountains of Gilead, Pisgah and Nebo. Can this numerical coincidence be the effect of accident? Mr. Horne, in enumerating the mountains of Palestine, refers to his description of Jerusalem, where he *had given* an account of the mountains which are either within the limits or in the immediate vicinity of that city. Mr. Carpenter refers to his "next section" for a notice of the same mountains!

Mr. Horne's second great division of his third volume is "Political Antiquities of the Jews;" this title is copied verbatim, and Mr. Horne's order (which we have seen in no other English writer before him) is in several instances copied, as well as almost every one of his English references.

In the departments of sacred and domestic antiquities, his order, and frequently the titles of his sections, is taken; not seldom portions of his matter, even to parentheses, which are *not* in the books which Mr. Carpenter has professed to cite.

We had marked many passages, principally from Mr. Horne, but some also from other authors, whose quotations Mr. Carpenter has made free to borrow, without acknowledgment. Not a section of Mr. Horne's work concludes without references to all the authorities consulted by him, among which are numerous foreign works; and on the same subjects Mr. Carpenter as punctually gives similar but mutilated references, always, however, *confining himself to English authorities*. We will subjoin one instance, taken at random. Having given the summary of the Cerinthian heresy, to which we have already adverted, Mr. Horne mentions his authorities in a note to vol. iv. p. 294.

"Mosheim's Commentaries, vol. i. pp. 337—347. Dr. Lardner's Works, 8vo. vol. ix. pp. 325—327.: 4to. vol. iv. pp. 567—569. Dr. Owen's Observations on the Four Gospels, pp. 88—92. To this learned writer we are chiefly indebted for the preceding observations."

Mr. Carpenter, having copied Mr. Horne's 293d and 294th pages verbatim, subjoins the following note, in page 175.

"Mosheim's Commentaries, vol. i. p. 337, &c. Lardner's Works, vol. iv. p. 567, &c. Owen on the Four Gospels, p. 88, &c. And Bishop Percy's Key, p. 58, &c."

This reference to Bishop Percy is merely thrown in to conceal the plagiarism; for that excellent little manual furnishes no additional light upon the subject. What the bishop has said appears to have been borrowed from Dr. Owen (for he cites no authority): and is, besides, printed in a different way; *he* numbers the several articles of the Cerinthian creed—Dr. Owen *does not*. Mr. Horne, who DID consult Dr. Owen, has condensed all the articles together in the summary he has given; dividing each article with

a hyphen (—), Mr. Carpenter copies Mr. Horne to these very hyphens, garbles his references, and superadds a reference to another writer who does not furnish any new illustration to the subject he pretends to have under discussion.

We could swell this article, already perhaps too long, to double its present extent. From what we have stated, however, we feel assured of the verdict which all candid readers must deliver respecting Mr. Carpenter's book, than which a grosser instance of plagiarism has never fallen under our cognizance. Mr. Carpenter does not pretend that his work is an abridgement. He offers it as a new work, drawn from original authorities; whereas he is indebted for all his most valuable English references to the labours of Mr. Horne and of other writers on sacred literature. Where *they* have honourably quoted, *he* has taken their quotations and their references without scruple, but he has most commonly garbled them with an &c. to conceal the amount of his obligations. Mr. Horne tells us (in his Preface), that his work has cost him the labour of more than twenty years; and great, we are persuaded, that labour must have been, and deeply shall we regret any injury that he may experience from any artful plagiarism; which, notwithstanding all the professions of its compiler, is defective as an introduction to the study of the Bible. We look in vain for information on many topics of Scripture antiquities and interpretation, which we had a right to expect: and we have no hesitation in saying, that any careful "English reader" of the Bible may, by the help of Bishop Tomline's manual, and of Fleury's Manners and Customs of the Israelites, acquire a much more accurate idea of the contents of the Sacred Volume, than they can from Mr. Carpenter's bulky volume.

ART. VII.—*Two Sermons, preached at Guildford, in the Archdeaconry of Stoke, in the County of Surrey, at the Spring and Autumn Visitations, 1825; the latter, before the Honourable and Venerable T. De Gray, M. A. Archdeacon of Surrey. By Charles Jerram, M. A. With an Appendix, on the subject of Baptismal Regeneration. 8vo. pp. 68. 2s. London. Wilson. 1826.*

To discover that we had been hitherto in error, to confess the fact before men, and to point out the method by which others may be undeceived, are three of the rarest, most difficult, and most useful works which a minister of religion can perform:

and each of them has been achieved with signal success by Mr. Jerram, in the unpretending pamphlet now before us. The facts of his case shall be communicated to our readers in his own perspicuous words.

“As my views on the subject of Baptismal Regeneration have undergone some change, and differ from those of many of my most respected friends, I think it right to give a short account of the circumstances which led to this change.

“About six years ago, a brother clergyman, for whom I entertain a high respect, put into my hands two manuscript sermons on baptismal regeneration, which he thought of publishing, with a request that I would freely state my opinion on the view which he had taken of the subject. As I was not quite satisfied with some of his statements, and had nothing better of my own to suggest, I determined to examine the subject *de novo*, and to form my own independent judgment of the whole. For this purpose I resolved to set aside all preconceived opinions; to forget, as far as I could, all that I had previously read; and to ascertain, if possible, what our church does really maintain upon it. It occurred to me that some confusion in my views of it might have arisen from an anxiety to reconcile the statement of our church with what appeared to me, the scripture doctrine of regeneration. I determined therefore, for the present, to think nothing of any apparent discrepancy of this nature; but to follow her through her formularies of baptism, her articles, and such other documents as might throw light on her meaning; and if, after all, I should find her in some respects at variance with the canon of truth, to ascribe the error to human infirmity, and to place the fact among the daily accumulating mass of proofs that nothing which proceeds from man is absolutely perfect. The result of this inquiry I will now frankly state. I am fully persuaded that our church does consider spiritual regeneration, in all cases, imparted to those who rightly receive the sacrament of baptism: or, in other words, that all who have the qualifications which our church supposes, and are baptised, according to her formularies, do, in truth, receive not only “the outward and visible sign” of this ordinance, but also “the inward and spiritual grace.” Following up this inquiry, in order to ascertain the opinion of the ancient fathers on this point, I am equally convinced that they identified baptism with spiritual regeneration; and pursuing the subject to the highest authority, I am also persuaded that this is the doctrine of the New Testament.”—pp. 47, 48.

Mr. Jerram proceeds to quote those well-known passages in the Baptismal Services, the Catechism, and the Articles, which prove that our church considers regeneration as conferred in baptism, and not as meaning what he had formerly supposed it to mean, and what “he presumes most of his respected friends” suppose it to mean—“the change of mind in which repentance and faith originate.” From the Church he proceeds to the Fathers, and from the Fathers to the Scripture.

“ Having thus ascertained, to my own satisfaction, the doctrine of our church as to spiritual regeneration, I consulted such of the primitive fathers as were within my reach, as to their views upon it ; and without stating the various steps which led to the conclusion, I have the fullest conviction that they are in the strictest accordance with our church. In the earliest and purest times of our religion, baptism and regeneration were used as synonymous and convertible terms.”—p. 54.

“ In pursuing this subject still further, and bringing it to the standard of scriptural authority, I observed that our church, whether right or wrong, does, in point of fact, ground her doctrine of baptismal regeneration on the word of God ; for in the commencement of her formulary for baptism, she states that ‘ our Saviour Christ saith, none can enter into the kingdom of God, except he be regenerate and born anew of water and of the Holy Ghost,’ alluding to the conversation which our Lord had with Nicodemus, as recorded in the third of St. John’s gospel, and which she evidently considers as relating to the Christian ordinance of baptism. I found also that the fathers of the primitive church founded the same doctrine on the same passage of scripture, for Justyn Martyr, in giving an account of the universal practice of the church respecting baptism, says, that all baptized persons are ‘ regenerated in the same manner as we ourselves were regenerated,’ by being ‘ washed in the name of the Father, the Son, and Holy Spirit ;’ ‘ for,’ he adds, ‘ Christ himself has said, “ unless ye be regenerated, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven :” ’ and that he here refers to our Lord’s conversation with Nicodemus, there can be no doubt ; because he immediately alludes to the impossibility of entering a second time into the mother’s womb, and being born. Now I satisfied myself as to the authority which our church and the primitive fathers had for grounding baptismal regeneration on this discourse of our Lord by the following considerations :—I found that the subject of regeneration by baptism was not a *new* doctrine in the time of our Lord. It had a much earlier date than that of the Christian dispensation, and was coeval with the ceremony of the Jews when they received among them a proselyte from the Gentiles.”—pp. 55, 56.

“ This historical fact illustrates the conversation which our Lord had with Nicodemus. This teacher of the Jews, who was convinced of our Lord’s Messiahship, came to him by night, to obtain further information respecting his new dispensation. He was immediately told that no man could enter into his kingdom unless he were ‘ born again.’ This declaration surprised Nicodemus, for though he must have well known that this figurative language was applied to Jewish proselytes, he had no conception that a Jew on acknowledging the Messiah, who was to descend from their father Abraham, stood in the same relation to this dispensation as a Gentile did to Judaism ; and therefore, seeing no propriety in the figurative allusion, as applicable to himself, he took the words in their natural sense, and asked the strange question, ‘ How can a man be born, when he is old ? Can he enter the second time into his mother’s womb, and be born ? ’ Upon this, our Lord renewed his assertion, with the additional information, that beside the baptism with

water, which had been hitherto customary, there must be a baptism of the Holy Spirit; and ‘except a man be born of water and of the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven.’ In this respect there was no difference between Jew or Gentile. Both must pass through the same ordeal; both must be born, like the Jewish proselyte, ‘of water;’ and more than this, no one could be a partaker of the ultimate blessings of this spiritual kingdom, who was not also ‘born of the spirit.’ At this declaration, Nicodemus again expresses his surprise. Every thing was contrary to his previous expectation, and he asks ‘how can these things be?’ Our Lord, then, in the language of reproof, says, ‘Art thou a master of Israel, and knowest not these things?’ and then argues the improbability of his understanding ‘heavenly things,’ if he had so little knowledge of facts of the most ordinary occurrence.”—pp. 57, 58.

His only remaining doubt was whether the Church and the Fathers “had used the term *regeneration* in the same sense as it is found in the New Testament:” and having observed that the sense of the word, when applied to this life, must always be metaphorical, he perceives that in Matthew, xix. 28, it must either “signify a transition from one state of things to another,” or refer to a future state of existence, while

“In the remaining passage (Titus, iii. 5.) the metaphorical is obviously the only true meaning. It runs thus: ‘After that the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the *washing of regeneration*, and renewing of the Holy Ghost.’ All commentators identify ‘the laver of regeneration’ with baptism, and therefore this is an unexceptionable scriptural sanction to our church, in denominating, as she has done, this ordinance regeneration; and that it means no more than a translation from a state of nature to that of grace, is plain, from the fact, that the change of soul and spirit, which is often represented as regeneration, is set forth in the following clause, by the expression ‘the renewing of the Holy Ghost.’

“Thus it appeared to me that the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, as held by our church, is supported by the authority of our Lord, and the only two passages in the New Testament where that term occurs: in the latter of them, clearly and unequivocally; and in the former, if understood *figuratively*, by direct implication, according to the opinion of many early commentators; and if *literally*, then it has no relation at all to the subject in question.”—pp. 61, 62.

This conclusive statement is not more creditable to the discernment of the writer, than the open rejection of a long-cherished error is creditable to his candour and love of truth. That he did not make the discovery sooner is no disparagement to his sagacity, nor to the correctness of his present opinions. It argues great ignorance of the power of prepossession to think that it must yield, as a matter of course, to reasons which appear unan-

swerable when they have gained an early admittance. It requires an unusual effort, an effort of which few men are capable, to bring religious tenets to a test, and reject whatsoever prove unsound. The worth of such an action cannot be easily overrated; and even if it is attended with partial failure, if the whole truth is not perceived at once, but is separated slowly, painfully, and partially from the baser matter in which it is imbedded, the agent in the process is still entitled to high commendation, and perhaps the change in his sentiments is more satisfactory to those whom he joins, and more useful to those whom he forsakes, than if a sudden rejection of old notions, and adoption of new ones, laid him open to the charge of fickleness, or to the suspicion of running eagerly from one extreme to another.

The latter accusation at least cannot be advanced against Mr. Jerram. On the contrary, we conceive that he has not yet discovered the full force of his own able reasonings, or pursued them to their legitimate conclusion. The following passages will explain our meaning.

“From what has been advanced, I think two or three things are very clear. The first is, that *Repentance and Faith are perfectly distinct from all that takes place in baptism, and form no part of what is there transacted or conferred.* They are required, in adults, as *qualifications* for baptism; and are stipulated for infants, as duties to be *hereafter* performed, when they arrive at a suitable age. Hence that change of mind, that renewal of soul, which are implied in Repentance and Faith, are evidently no part of baptismal regeneration; they are distinct in themselves, and take place at different times. It is obvious then, that, whatever be the nature of baptismal regeneration, it ought never to be confounded with that change of heart which Repentance and Faith suppose and imply. Admitting that all infants are partakers of the former, still not one of them can be exempted from the necessity of the latter, when they become practicable; and so long as an individual in our flock continues in impenitence and unbelief, it is our duty to insist upon the necessity of “Repentance toward God, and Faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ.” By whatever name we may designate this change of heart, whether we call it regeneration, renovation, or conversion, it must take place, or there can be no participation of the blessings of the gospel.”—p. 39.

“I observe, therefore, lastly, that *our church considers all her members as having undergone a twofold change*; one in their *nature*, the fruit of which is Repentance and Faith; the other in their *state and condition*, by which the benefits of the Gospel are conferred, and this is by baptism: and they bear the relation to each other of *duties* and *privileges*: the former belongs to us, and the latter to God. In strictness, indeed, both these changes proceed from God. The grace or power of Repentance and Faith as really comes from him as the remission of sin and the gift of the Holy Ghost: but still there is a wide difference between the two. It is the bounden duty of every sinner to

repent and believe the Gospel, and he is again and again commanded to do so, and the performance of these is his own act ; but it is not man's province in any way to confer pardon of sin, or the privilege of adoption, or the reward of eternal life. This is God's prerogative, and is exercised without any participation with man. Now when it is observed, that it is to the change in our state and condition, to the conferring of inestimable privileges and spiritual blessings, to the introduction to a new and glorious order of things, that our church has appropriated the term Regeneration ; we have only to restrict our use of it, when we would speak with doctrinal precision, to this blessed change ; and we shall be at liberty to avail ourselves of all the variety of expression with which the holy Scripture and the nature of the thing furnish us, to set forth the nature and necessity of the former change ; for it may with great propriety be called a renovation of heart, a renewal of the soul in righteousness, a participation of the divine nature, a new creation, a conformity of the will and affections to the mind of God, and the only source from which a life of Christian obedience can flow."—pp. 41—43.

We apprehend that in these passages Mr. Jerram has not adhered to the admirable plan which led him to discover the true meaning of regeneration. He observes, most justly, (p. 49) that "repentance and faith" are requisites for baptism ; that in adults they are pre-requisites, and that persons baptized in infancy 'are bound to perform them both, when they come to age.' But what is meant by 'repentance and faith?' Upon what authority does Mr. Jerram state that they imply 'a change of mind,' 'a renewal of soul,' 'a change of nature, the fruit of which is repentance and faith,' 'a participation of the divine nature, a new creation, a conformity of the will and affections to the mind of God, and the only source from which a life of Christian obedience can flow?' We answer without hesitation, not upon the authority of the Church. We refer him confidently to the Baptismal Services, the Catechism, the Confirmation Service, and the Liturgy, for a different explanation of the words. The Catechism declares the requisites for baptism to be "repentance whereby we forsake sin, and faith whereby we steadfastly believe the promises of God made to us in that sacrament;" and adds, that infants promise both of these by their sureties. The public baptism of infants gives the promise of their sureties at full length ; and it contains a pledge "to renounce the devil and all his works, and constantly believe God's holy word and commandments." In the Confirmation Service, the persons that come to be confirmed, "renew the solemn promise and vow which was made in their name at baptism, ratifying and confirming the same in their own persons, and acknowledging themselves bound to believe and do *all those*

things which their godfathers and godmothers then undertook for them."

The difference, therefore, between the statements of Mr. Jerram and the Church, is, that the latter considers "repentance and faith," as synonymous with renouncing the devil, believing God's word, and obeying his commandments; while the former explains the words as implying more than this, viz. an entire change of heart and nature, of which the fruit will be repentance and faith, and without which repentance and faith cannot exist. This difference is very important, especially when Mr. Jerram tells us, in a note to his Appendix, (p. 49.) that the Church applies the word regeneration "to the grace that confers privileges on Christians, and not to that which gives the power to perform duties." How this can be said of a Church which explicitly declares that Jesus Christ hath promised in his gospel, that he would vouchsafe to receive the child about to be baptized, "to release him of his sins, to sanctify him with the Holy Ghost, to give him the kingdom of heaven, and everlasting life," we are utterly at a loss to conceive. Can an individual be sanctified with the Holy Ghost, and yet want that grace which gives the power to perform duties? And if such grace were not given in baptism, and yet were indispensable to the salvation of every individual who arrives at years of discretion, can we believe that the church would never once have mentioned it? She mentions the baptismal vow, again and again: she reminds the sponsors of it, she teaches children to say that they are bound to do and perform all things that were promised for them; and she calls upon catechumens, to ratify and confirm the same, with their own mouth and consent, openly before the congregation. But that the grace given in baptism confers no power of doing these things, is neither stated, nor implied, nor even hinted at, from one end of the Prayer-book to the other.

Nor would an appeal to Scripture be more successful than an appeal to the Church. Mr. Jerram refers us to Acts, xx. 20, 21. "I kept back nothing that was profitable unto you, but have showed you, and have taught you publicly, and from house to house, testifying both to the Jews and to the Greeks, Repentance toward God, and Faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." This does not prove that the repentance and faith, thus testified by St. Paul, can only be produced by a grace different from that which is conferred in baptism. Nor, indeed, has it any bearing upon the precise question which Mr. Jerram is examining. For to whom did the apostle thus testify? either to *unbelieving* Jews and Greeks, in which case the passage has no immediate reference to Christians, or to *believing* Jews and

Gentiles, in which case it refers to men who embraced Christianity after they had arrived at years of discretion, and must, consequently, have repented and believed before they were baptized. But even if he could escape from this dilemma, Mr. Jerram would not be nearer to his point. We most cordially admit the universal necessity of repentance and faith; it was testified, as he observes, by St. Paul; it was testified by St. Peter; it is testified throughout the whole Bible in characters which they that run may read. But where is it said, that such repentance must be *preceded* by a change of nature, a change of heart, a renewal of the soul in righteousness, and a participation of the divine nature? That it must be preceded by *grace*, there can be no doubt; but that grace must completely change our nature before we can feel repentance, that is to say, such sorrow for sin as produces newness of life, is a mere assumption without proof. The only passages from Scripture which have ever been adduced to establish it, are those which Mr. Jerram most justly considers as applying to regeneration in baptism, and which, consequently, he is estopped from quoting in support of another change not wrought in baptism. And if, as we flatter ourselves, the same conscientious search after truth, which has led him to discover the sentiments of the church on regeneration, should also enable him to discover her sentiments on repentance and conversion, we have only to hope that he may follow up that discovery, by perceiving that, in the latter as well as in the former instance, the church is not at variance with the Scripture.

There is one other passage to which we must request the attention of our readers.

“In the course of this investigation, many collateral subjects came under my consideration, and seem to have received new light from their relation to this important topic; especially, I have been struck with the importance which our church, in common with the New Testament, attaches to the duties of repentance and faith. She admits none of a responsible age to a participation of her spiritual privileges who have not performed these duties. And upon this point I cannot but think there has been a serious neglect among many of her ministers. It appears to me that these duties have not been inculcated in their real nature and importance, upon all descriptions of characters, with that frequency and urgency which the extremity of the case demands; and it is precisely here that two very distinct classes of Christian ministers in our church appear to be at issue. One of them much insists on the necessity of all, without exception, experiencing that change of heart which leads to a godly sorrow for sin, and an entire dependence on the atoning sacrifice of Jesus Christ for its pardon; and they deny that the sacraments are of any avail without it. The other class do indeed press these duties on the profane and profligate; but they seem to think

them unnecessary to those who have been religiously educated, and have not materially departed from the decencies of Christianity. With regard to these, they would urge the importance of improvement, and of forming progressive habits of piety; but they do not appear to think that any thing like that internal change of heart, which the former consider as essential to true repentance and faith, is requisite. It should seem that all the change that was needed took place in baptism, and that all that now remains is to cherish the grace then received; and everything that is required of a Christian will be fully accomplished.

“Now this doctrine appears to me at equal variance with our church, which requires all, without exception, to repent and believe; and excludes those that have not done so, from the spiritual privileges of the gospel; and also, with the New Testament, which testifies both to Jews and Gentiles, to the race of man universally, the necessity of repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ.”—p. 62.

The doctrinal portion of this extract is merely a repetition of sentiments which have been already examined. But the statement respecting the mode of preaching, which Mr. Jerram condemns, is, to say the least of it, inaccurate. He tells us, that there is a class, who think it unnecessary to press certain duties upon any, except the profane and the profligate. And what are these duties? “The change of heart which leads to a godly sorrow for sin, and an entire dependence on the atoning sacrifice of Christ;” or as he expresses it lower down, “repentance and faith.” That is to say, because a class of preachers does not maintain the universal necessity of a certain change, which Mr. Jerram considers essential to repentance and faith, therefore such preachers do not maintain the universal necessity for repentance and faith!! We can only say that no such class of preachers is known to us; nor to the best of our belief, can it be pointed out by Mr. Jerram. A gentleman who has given such convincing proofs of readiness to retract an error in doctrine, must be equally ready to retract an error in fact; and when he next describes a set of men from whom he is compelled to differ, we are sure that he will be scrupulously careful to describe them as they are. The mistake into which he has been betrayed is, we doubt not, unintentional, and ought not to diminish the praise and thanks that are due to him for his candid avowal of ancient mistakes, and clear exposition of his present opinions.

ART. IX.—*The History of the Inquisition of Spain, from the time of its establishment to the reign of Ferdinand VII. composed from the Original Documents of the Archives of the Supreme Council, and from those of subordinate Tribunals of the Holy Office.* Abridged and translated from the Original Works of D. Jean Antoine Llorente, formerly Secretary of the Inquisition, Chancellor of the University of Toledo, Knight of the Order of Charles III., &c. 1 vol. 8vo. 15s. London. Whitaker, 1826.

OUR *direct* knowledge of the history and transactions of the Inquisition is unusually scanty, and in most instances, carries with it but little weight of authority. Nor indeed do we readily see how this could be otherwise; for secrecy was one of the leading principles of this institution, and that which it sought to hide could be revealed by two methods only; the treachery of its agents, or the disclosures of such victims as had escaped its extreme vengeance. It is evident that no great reliance can be placed on either of these sources; the good faith of a deserter is proverbially mistrusted; and however truly an unhappy prisoner might relate his own individual sufferings, he would not have possessed more opportunities than other men of becoming acquainted with the *general* system by which they were occasioned. Moreover it was inconsistent with the keen-eyed vigilance of this tribunal, that *many* who, in either of these ways, had obtained the power of unlocking the secrets of its prison-house, should return to upper day. Hence it is, that in the professed Histories of the Inquisition, we are presented with little more than transcripts from each other; that the mode of arrest, the conduct of audiences, the horrors of the torture-chamber, and the final dismissal to penance or liberty, have been copied, with slight variation, from quarto to duodecimo, and re-copied back again from duodecimo to quarto, without sufficient vouchers for authenticity or accuracy; and although it may be too much to assert, that the whole is false, nevertheless we have little doubt that the major part is either purely imaginary, or a mixture, in which a weak tincture of Truth is largely “dashed and brewed with lies.”

The earliest account of the *Spanish* Inquisition, with which we are acquainted, is contained in a small French volume, without the name of the place in which it was printed, but bearing date 1568, *Histoire de l’Inquisition d’Espagne*; and this, in many points, more especially in the disgusting description of the question, is copied nearly to the letter, by almost every succeeding writer on the subject. The work is anonymous, and does not

present any *data* upon which a judgment of the pretensions of its author to our confidence can be founded. As far, then, as this tract has been followed by others, we may be forgiven if belief in it is suspended. In 1656 an English narrative of the enormities of this tribunal was dedicated to Cromwell, then Protector, under the title of *Clamor Sanguinis Martyrum*; but this, in like manner, is devoid of authorities. Geddes, who was Chaplain of the English Factory at Lisbon, from 1678 to 1686, was a man of acute observation; he had witnessed an *auto-da-fé* in that Capital in 1682—and he recounts the pathetic exclamation of one of the condemned, who, during the short interval between the gate of his dungeon and the stake, raised his eyes with rapture to the Sun, which he had not beheld for many years, and asked how it was possible that those who saw that glorious body could worship any being but Him who created it. He was immediately gagged, and the procession (*horrendum ac tremendum spectaculum*, as Pegna, himself an Inquisitor, has fitly termed it,) moved on. The exercise of ministerial functions by a Protestant clergyman gave offence to the Portuguese Inquisition, and Geddes was summoned before it. He pleaded the existing treaty between the two Governments, and contended boldly, but ineffectually, for his privilege; and, in the end, notwithstanding the manly support which he received from the English merchants, who wrote home representing their case, and claiming a right to a Chaplain and the free exercise of their Religion, he was suspended by the Ecclesiastical Commission, through the agency of which James II. was at that time labouring to restore Popery in England. Of that which Geddes relates in his *View of the Inquisition in Portugal* (*Misc. Tracts*, I. 5.) whenever he speaks from his own knowledge, there can be no occasion to doubt; and the picture is sufficiently terrific. He had seen, with his own eyes, the insane barbarity, and heard the deafening yells of the populace when they were preparing to “make the dogs beards.” Before the piles were lighted, the miserable victims, who were chained on a seat near their summit, were exposed to the insults of the crowd which surrounded them; and, at a given signal, bundles of lighted furze, fastened on long poles, were thrust in their faces, till their chins were singed to a coal; and this prelude of torture lasted during more than half an hour, before the fagots were kindled, and they expired under a slow flame; for their height above the fire was such that it barely reached their seats.

Limborch, who comes next in order of time, had doubtless received much information from Orobio, a Spanish Jew, who, after escaping from the Inquisition, had returned to Amsterdam, and with whom this distinguished Arminian held a much more

important "friendly conference," (*collatio amica*) respecting the great truths of Christianity. But Orobio probably had little to communicate beyond that which respected himself. It was the possession of a Book of Sentences of the Inquisition of Thoulouse which gave Limborch deeper insight into the mysteries of this accursed Court. This black register contained all the Sentences passed between 1307 to 1323, and Limborch appended it to a *Historia Inquisitionis*, 1692, in which many valuable facts are ably and ingeniously deduced from writings of certain Inquisitors, of whom a catalogue is prefixed to his work. This is by far the most legitimate, and, indeed, the only safe basis on which the discoveries of such an Historian can be founded. It is scarcely necessary to state, that this work of Limborch was translated into English in 1736, by the learned and laborious Sam. Chandler, who prefaced it by a copious Introduction, from his own pen, on the rise and progress of Persecution, and the real and pretended causes of it: a paper which led him into a controversy with Dr. Berriman. Wherever Limborch relies solely upon his own acuteness and sagacity, he presents his readers with a narrative ably and substantially put together, upon framework not likely to be disjointed—but occasionally he has condescended to borrow; and whenever he does so, our confidence ceases. His work, however, on the whole, is not only the fullest, but by far the most important with which we have met on this subject.

A French work, *Memoires Historiques pour servir à l'Histoire des Inquisitions*, was produced at Cologne in 1716, in two volumes, 12mo. It contains some pretty cuts in *taille douce*, and is put together without any deficiency in the flimsiness and presumption which, for the most part, characterize *Memoires pour servir*. Mr. Baker, a clergyman, in 1736 compiled an English quarto, which pretends to little, and fulfils its pretences; and we believe that the booksellers, from time to time, have put forth sundry minor works on the Inquisition, as often as a demand seemed to present itself; in which the undigested *crambe* of former Histories has been diligently recooked, and engravings of the vault of torture, the *san benito*, the *fuego revolto*, and the skulls, marrowbones, and devils of the *relaxed*, have been carefully inserted.

The work of Paolo Sarpi relates more particularly to Venice, *Historia dell' Inquisitione e particolarmente della Veneta*—in its announcement there is no want of confidence: *Opera pia, dotta e curiosa, a consiglieri, casuisti e politici molto necessaria*; and, what perhaps will scarcely be anticipated, after such a puff direct, it does not vaunt itself beyond its merits. It contains a great mass of official *formulæ*, from which a distinct view may be obtained of, at least, the outward modes of procedure, in the parti-

cular Court of which it treats. Michel Angelo Lerri, Inquisitor of Modena, has left a similar tract respecting his own tribunal. *Breve informazione del modo di trattare le cause*, 1608.

In English we have three narratives, furnished by separate individuals who have been imprisoned in the dungeons of the Inquisition. William Lithgow's account of his travels and sufferings, is very generally known; and although largely interspersed with the marvellous, it bears internal evidence of truth in many of those parts relating to the inquiry now before us. Lithgow was a pedestrian, of the school of the fantastic Tom Coryat; and he verified the adage which adjudges to pupils a superiority over their masters: for Coryat was far outwalked by him. "In his three voyages," as he himself informs us, "his painful feet have traced over, besides passages of seas and rivers, thirty-six thousand and odd miles, which draweth near to twice the circumference of the earth." But his evil stars put an end to his ambulatory powers, by throwing him into the grasp of the Inquisition at Malaga. He was arrested at first on suspicion of being a spy, in 1620; but the charge was speedily converted into one of heresy, and attempts were made to compel him to change his faith. During the progress of this regeneration, he was so cruelly subjected to torture, as to be crippled for life. A fortunate accident enabled him to make his circumstances known to the English ambassador, and he was demanded from and surrendered by his persecutors. Of the miserable state to which their barbarities had reduced him, sufficient ocular testimony was afforded to the most incredulous; for, on his arrival in England, such was still his mangled condition, that when James I. expressed a wish to see and converse with him, he was obliged to be conveyed on a feather bed to Theobald's, where he was repeatedly exhibited to a crowded Court. The king sent him twice, at his own expense, to Bath, for the benefit of the waters; but his partial restoration was but the forerunner of new misfortunes. He had been directed by James to apply to Gondomar, the Spanish ambassador, for the full value of the property which had been taken from him by the Governor of Malaga, and for an additional sum as a compensation for the injustice of his confinement. Gondomar promised fairly, but protracted the fulfilment of his promise; and Lithgow, in a moment of irritation, bitterly upbraided him in the Presence Chamber. The pride of the Spaniard could not brook this public insult, and the parties drew, and fought upon the privileged spot. The rank of Gondomar secured him from punishment for this high offence; but the less protected Lithgow atoned for it by nine months fresh imprisonment in the Marshalsea.

Isaac Martin passed two thirds of a year in the prisons of the Inquisition at Granada, in 1718. He also was released by the interposition of the English ambassador, but not until he had received 200 lashes. His story may be found in a small volume published by himself at the time, and it is repeated by Baker. The latest prisoner who has recounted his sufferings in English is John Coustos, a lapidary, and a native of Berne. He was arrested on a charge of Freemasonry, which he did not attempt to deny, by the Inquisition at Lisbon; and, after numerous unavailing attempts to seduce him from his profession of Protestantism, he was condemned to the galleys: an application from George II. procured his discharge after a short service; and he found an asylum in England, where he published his adventures in 1746. From the tone of the Preface which introduces them, it was plainly the intention of the existing Ministry, under whose auspices they were edited, to address them to a political object: since an exposure of the frauds and cruelties practised by the great public organ of the Roman Catholic Church, might be thought well calculated to strengthen the national abhorrence from that Religion, for the revival of which, under the expelled dynasty, the flames of Civil war had so recently been kindled. Notwithstanding this party purpose, we see no reason for discrediting the narrative of Coustos, and still less that of Martin; and *as far as they go*, *i. e.* as affecting the individual cases, they both afford damning evidence of the iniquity of this institution.

But by those who will take the trouble of weaving their own texture from the raw material, and of creating for themselves that most powerful and incontrovertible of all convictions, which is furnished by deductions fairly drawn from the statements of the very parties concerning whom they seek information—deductions which these parties, when they made these statements, never imagined, and still less intended, should be drawn,—a plentiful harvest may be found in the works of the Inquisitors themselves. Nicolas Eymeric, a Dominican, was created Inquisitor General of the Kingdom of Arragon in the year 1356. He was afterwards named Chaplain to Gregory XI. at Avignon, and Judge of Heretical Causes, and he died a Cardinal, having filled these high and confidential offices during four and forty years. No one, therefore, can be supposed more competent to tell all which the Holy Office permitted or desired to be told; and, accordingly, the patient investigator of truth will meet with a rich treasure in his *Directorium Inquisitorum*. This work was first printed at Barcelona in 1503; afterwards twice at Rome in 1578 and 1587, and at Venice in 1596, each time with the commentaries of Pegna, of whom we shall have occasion to speak presently. It

is divided into three parts. The first treats of the Articles of Faith: the second of the punishments assigned to heretics by the Canon law and the Decretals; of heresy itself and its different kinds; and of the crimes which fall under the jurisdiction of the Inquisition: the third of the various processes of this tribunal; of the power and privileges of its officers; of witnesses, criminals, judgments, and executions. It is not possible within our present limits to do more than offer this slight abstract of the principal heads of this important work. Its value, however, may be estimated by a recollection that it is the fruit of the experience, during almost half a century, of one who was the prime mover of the great engine, the machinery of which he partially describes.

The tract of Johannes Calderinus (he must not be confounded with his namesake, Domitius, who was an admirable classical scholar, and flourished near a century before,) *de Hæreticis*, appeared in 1571. Like that of Eymeric, it is a copious Directory, but we know too little of its author (alas! for fame! he is stated at the head of his first chapter to be *inter primarios suæ ætatis celeberrimus*,) to determine his competence to the task. Pegna, a Spaniard, whom we have before mentioned, in 1588 was Auditor, and subsequently Dean of the Roman Rota. Besides commenting upon the work of Eymeric, he edited the *Lucerna Inquisitorum* of Franciscus Bernardus Comensis, and himself wrote an *Instructio seu Praxis Inquisitorum*; titles which sufficiently declare the nature and contents of the works to which they belong. To these may be added the names of three other volumes; one by Francesco Bruno, *De Indiciis et Torturâ*—Lyons, 1547; another by Paramo, *De Origine et Progressu Officii Sanctæ Inquisitionis, ejusque dignitate et UTILITATE*: Madrid, 1598; and the last by Carena, who writes himself *Advocatus Fiscalis Off. Inq.*, and who published at Cremona, in 1642, *De Off. Inq. et Modo procedendi in causis Fidei*.

Of Archibald Bower we have purposely forbore to speak. We believe him to have been a cunning and needy Scotchman, who would have said and done anything for money, and who therefore can have little claims upon our credence. That he was educated at the College of Douay, was admitted into the order of Jesus, publicly taught Humanities (as his learned countrymen express themselves) and Philosophy under its direction, and in the end became Counsellor of the Inquisition at Macerata, we see no reason to deny. After this hopeful training, at forty years of age, in 1726, he abandoned his offices, escaped from Italy, and turned a hackney Protestant scribbler in England. He himself stated that this exchange arose from disgust at the enormities which he had witnessed in the Holy Office. Others boldly

asserted, that it was in consequence of the discovery of an intrigue with a Nun to whom he was Confessor; and there appears nothing in his general character, or subsequent conduct, which justifies us in pronouncing this accusation to be untrue. His *Faithful Account of his Motives for leaving the office of Secretary to the Court of Inquisition*, was printed in 1750. Little credit was attached to it at the time, and his reputation, which was at a very low standard among his contemporaries, has not been elevated above it by the judgment of posterity.

A predecessor in the same line with Bower, and as much his superior in honesty as he was below him in abilities, (for the Scotch Ex-Jesuit possessed a considerable coating of knowledge, and a truly national dexterity in displaying and applying it,) was Hieronimo Barthelemi Piazza. He had been a Dominican, a Reader of Philosophy and Divinity, and one of the Delegated Judges of the Roman Inquisition. Having taken refuge in England, he published in 1722 *A Short and True Account of the Inquisition and its Proceedings, as it is practised in Italy, set forth in some particular Cases, by H. B. P. &c.; and now by the grace of God a convert to the Church of England*. Piazza married and settled in Cambridge, where he obtained a livelihood by teaching French and Italian, more, as is recorded, to his own profit than that of his pupils. But his integrity was never impeached, and his book contains some curious particulars, which we have no doubt are authentic. That his former trade, even after his retirement, had left some of its hardness about his heart, may reasonably be supposed; and it is probably on this account that he relates the following piteous anecdote, which fell under his own immediate cognizance, with much unction and evident glee, as if he thought it a capital good story. A hue and cry was raised by the Inquisition after an offender who was *wanted*, and a particular description of his person was diligently circulated. He must have been sufficiently ill-favoured, for the unhappy Sosia who was arrested by mistake in his stead, is described as “a country curate of poor look and weakly condition, pale, lean, and of grave countenance.” Terrified by his accusation, although conscious of his innocence, this miserable prisoner, when brought up to be examined a second time by Piazza, “would answer nothing but, always trembling, *Quod dixi, dixi; quod scripsi, scripsi*.” “This comical story” of “the speechless and whimsical curate,” was immediately communicated to head-quarters; and the close of it is detailed as follows:—

“So the poor country curate, *his hands being tied behind his back*, was carried on horseback with great solemnity, as is usual upon such occasions, surrounded by all the *Signori Patentati* and their servants, in a

cavalcade, I being at the head of 'em, from Osimo to Ancona, where the General Inquisitor resided. Here he exerted all his *cunning*, industry, and CRUELTY to make the poor curate speak, but to no purpose, TILL AT LAST HE WAS FOUND TO HAVE TURNED MAD, AND AT THE SAME TIME WAS DISCOVERED TO BE INNOCENT; for we heard from other Inquisitors that the person that was indeed guilty, had been lately arrested and taken up in some other place. This was the end of the pitiful case of this poor country curate, who was finally set at liberty and declared innocent by the General Inquisitor; but what became of him afterwards God knows, for I never heard any news of him after this *unlucky accident*."

This sad history does not require any comment. A respectable and unoffending Ecclesiastic is dragged as a public spectacle, exposed to the scorn of the rabble, before a tribunal, the well known horrors of which deprive him of his senses. Torture is used (for so much we think may fairly be understood by "cruelty") to procure his self-condemnation; and when his innocence is incontestably established, he is turned loose and unprotected on the world, without any compensation for his sufferings, or any guardianship over his insanity, too happy to have escaped with liberty, or perhaps with life, from the probable consequences of this "unlucky accident." It was Bower's falsification of this story which mainly led to the detection of his imposition. He laid the scene at Macerata, in the archives of the Inquisitorial Court of which place he pretended to have read the particulars.

A single other name will bring to an end our references to the writers on the Inquisition with whom we chance to be acquainted: a list which we feel that we have already extended beyond its due limits. Of the personal history of Reginaldus, or Gonsalvius Montanus, very little can now be learned, except that he was a Spaniard and a Protestant. He is supposed by Limborch to have collected a reformed congregation at Seville, about the time of the decease of Charles V.; and it is evident from his writings that he afterwards was a Professor at Heidelberg, where he published, in 1567, *Sanctæ Inquisitionis Hispanicæ Artes aliquot selectæ ac palam traductæ*. Most of the cases with which he illustrates the enormities of this tribunal, are repeated by some student who had heard them from his mouth, and who printed them at Heidelberg, about forty years after the appearance of this work, under the form of *De Inquisitione Hisp. oratiunculæ vii. ex narrationibus* R. C. M.; and from one or the other of these sources they have been unsparingly borrowed by later compilers. Señor Llorente says, but without citing authority, (and we have not met with any confirmation of the statement,) that Gonsalvius had escaped from the prisons of the Inquisition at Seville. As we have not any guide to assure us of their authenticity, we abstain

from citing any details; but we shall present our readers with the good round vituperation, in two learned languages, with which he assails the Institution, the wickedness of which he undertakes to expose by facts:—

“Est igitur Inquisitio horribilis, execrabilis et, post Ecclesiæ nomen cognitum, inaudita etiam apud efferatissimas gentes, et, ut uno verbo dicam, planè Diabolica, tam animi quam corporis, carnificina. quam contrà fas et jus divinum ac humanum, Romani Pontificis mancipia, permissu Regum et jussu Antichristi, exercent in fideles; eà immanitate quâ major animo concipi nequeat, nedum oratione exponi; tantùm in hunc finem, ut Idololatria Hetrusca stabiliatur, et superstitio Romana ad posteritatem propagetur, cum certo Fidei Christianæ interitu.”

To the end of the volume are appended certain epigrams, from which we shall venture to select one, which may enable our readers to determine the reason which induces us not to transcribe more.

In Triumviros Inquisitionis.

Τισιφόνητε καὶ Αληκτῶ, δεινὴ τε Μέγαιρα
 Τιμωρὸι ασεβῶν, ὡς λόγος, εἰν Αἴδη:
 Εὐσεβέων δ' ἀνδρῶν ἐνὶ γῇ τρεῖς εἰσὶν Ἰβηρες
 Δῆμοι ὁμότεροι τετρακίς Εὐμενίδων.

But it is time to come to Señor Llorente, from whose confused and ill arranged histories we shall endeavour to pick out the most striking particulars. It is but just to the original author to premise, that the English work is an abridgement; but the compiler speaks of that which he has translated as “complex and voluminous,” and of his own version as being “free and condensed.” All things will bear comparison, and it is probable that, if we had the means of consulting the originals, we might assent to the latter part of this statement, respecting which, at present, we are compelled to express some doubt.

Señor Llorente styles himself Secretary to the Inquisition of Madrid during the years 1789, 1790 and 1791, and therefore he has “the firmest confidence of being able to give to the world a true code of the secret laws by which the interior of the Inquisition was governed, and to compile this History.”

“No one could write a complete and authentic History of the Inquisition, who was not either an Inquisitor or a Secretary of the Holy Office. Persons holding only these situations could be permitted to make memoranda of Papal Bulls, the ordinances of Sovereigns, the decisions of the Council of the ‘*Suprême*,’ of the originals of the preliminary processes for suspicion of heresy, or extracts of those which had been deposited in the archives. *Being myself the Secretary of the Inquisition of Madrid*, during the years 1789, 1790 and 1791, I have the firmest confidence in my being able to give to the world a true code of the secret laws by which the interior of the Inquisition was governed, of those laws which were veiled by mystery from

all mankind, excepting those men to whom the knowledge of their political import was exclusively reserved. A firm conviction, from knowing the deep objects of this tribunal, that it was vicious in principle, in its constitution, and in its laws, notwithstanding all that has been said in its support, induced me to avail myself of the advantage my situation afforded me, and to collect every document I could procure relative to its history. My perseverance has been crowned with success far beyond my hopes, for in addition to an abundance of materials, obtained with labour and expense, consisting of unpublished manuscripts and papers, mentioned in the inventories of deceased Inquisitors, and other officers of the institution, in 1809, 1810 and 1811, when the Inquisition of Spain was suppressed, all the archives were placed at my disposal; and from 1809 to 1812 I collected everything that appeared to me to be of consequence in the registers of the Council of the Inquisition, and in the provincial tribunals, for the purpose of compiling this History."—*Preface*, pp. 12, 13.

There is much about this account which gives us but an evil impression of its author. During the three years that he was Secretary he was deeply convinced of the iniquity of the office in which he was engaged, and yet he continued in it, for no other purpose, as it would seem, than to collect materials for his History; a History which he would never have ventured to publish but for the events which led to the overthrow of the Inquisition; an event it is scarcely possible that he could have enough foresight and sagacity to prognosticate six and thirty years ago. Of his personal history nothing further is communicated save the following singular paragraph, which places the author on a level with that which Tucca and Varis were intended to be, and the Sultan Omar really was.

"When Joseph was acknowledged King of Spain, the archives of the Supreme Council and of the Court of Inquisition were confided to me, in consequence of an order from his Majesty. With his approbation, I burnt all the criminal processes, except those which belonged to History, from their importance, and the rank of the accused; but I preserved all the registers of the resolutions of the Council, the Royal Ordinances, the Papal Bulls and Briefs, the papers of the affairs of the tribunal, and all the informations taken concerning the genealogies of the persons employed in the Holy Office, on account of their utility in proving relationship in trials when it is necessary."—p. 566.

The Preface, moreover, concludes with a statement of a cruelty so atrocious as not a little to stagger our confidence in the judgment, if not in the veracity of this writer. It requires a large proportion of credulity to admit that such a punishment as is described below could be adjudged, only six years back, in a civilized European Capital; and that by a tribunal which it is admitted (p. 61.) has long ceased to inflict torture on its prisoners.

"The following fact shows that the inquisitors of our own days do not fall below the standard of those who followed the fanatic Torquemada. * * * * was present when the Inquisition was thrown open, in 1820, by the orders of the Cortes of Madrid. Twenty-one prisoners were found in it, not one of whom knew the name of the city in which he was: some had been confined three years, some a longer period, and not one knew perfectly the nature of the crime of which he was accused.

"One of these prisoners had been condemned, and was to have suffered on the following day. His punishment was to be death by the *Pendulum*. The method of thus destroying the victim is as follows:—the condemned is fastened in a groove, upon a table, on his back; suspended above him is a *Pendulum*, the edge of which is sharp, and it is so constructed as to become longer with every movement. The wretch sees this implement of destruction swinging to and fro above him, and every moment the keen edge approaching nearer and nearer: at length it cuts the skin of his nose, and gradually cuts on, until life is extinct. It may be doubted if the holy office in its mercy ever invented a more humane and rapid method of exterminating heresy, or ensuring confiscation. This, let it be remembered, was a punishment of the *Secret Tribunal*, A. D. 1820 !!!—*Preface*, p. xix.

Having thus vented our misgivings, we have put it in the power of our readers to decide for themselves as to the degree of trust which they may choose to repose in Señor Llorente. On his opening chapter there is little occasion to pause; it is a very meagre abstract of Church History during the first twelve centuries. To the thirteenth century, in common with other writers, he attributes the establishment of a General Inquisition; planned by Innocent III. against the Albigenses, furthered under his auspices by St. Dominic, and finally established by Gregory IX., who was elected to the Papedom in 1227. The Arragonese branch can be traced by authentic records as far back as the year 1232, and, in the course of this century, Courts were established in the Dioceses of Tarragona, Barcelona, Urgel, Lerida and Girona. Castile adopted it in the fifteenth century. The crimes over which the old Inquisition professed to exercise jurisdiction, were heresy and suspicion of heresy, sorcery, the invocation of dæmons, schism, concealment or assistance of heretics, and refusal by a noble to take an oath that he would expel heretics from any possessions over which he had power. Bishops were the ordinary Inquisitors, by divine right; but the delegates appointed by the Pope were independent of them; and although the Inquisition had a particular prison for the accused, yet Bishops, if called upon, were obliged to lend their houses for the abode of prisoners. No reader of any English history, unless it be Dr. Lingard's, is likely to have forgotten the tender mercies of Butcher Bonner's Coal Hole.

On the accession of Ferdinand and Isabella, and the consequent union of the Kingdoms of Arragon and Castile, the Inquisition was permanently established in both, under much more severe regulations, and in that which may be considered its *modern form*. Its efforts at first were principally directed against the Jews; many of them, though outwardly converted through fear, and called *New Christians*, or *Marranos*, (the cursed race,) secretly returned to the Religion of their fathers. Confiscation was a grand object with the avaricious Ferdinand, and the Inquisition afforded him a ready instrument for wringing their treasure from the golden Hebrews. The unbaptized were forbidden from exercising the profession of physician, surgeon, barber, merchant and innkeeper, they were compelled to wear a distinguishing badge, and to inhabit separate quarters, to which they were to retire before night.

“ A convert was considered as relapsed into heresy, if he kept the sabbath out of respect to the law which he had abandoned; this was sufficiently proved if he wore better linen and garments on that day than those which he commonly used, or had not a fire in the house from the preceding evening; if he took the suet and fat from the animals which were intended for his food, and washed the blood from it; if he examined the blade of the knife before he killed the animals, and covered the blood with earth; if he blessed the table after the manner of the Jews; if he has drunk of the wine named *caser*, (a word derived from *caxer*, which means *lawful*,) and which is prepared by Jews; if he pronounces the *bahara* or benediction when he takes the vessel of wine into his hands, and pronounces certain words before he gives it to another person; if he eats of an animal killed by Jews; if he has recited the Psalms of David without repeating the *Gloria Patri* at the end; if he gives his son a Hebrew name chosen among those used by the Jews; if he plunges him seven days after his birth into a basin containing water, gold, silver, seed-pearl, wheat, barley, and other substances, pronouncing at the same time certain words, according to the custom of the Jews; if he draws the horoscope of his children at their birth; if he performs the *ruaya*, a ceremony which consists in inviting his relations and friends to a repast the day before he undertakes a journey; if he turned his face to the wall at the time of his death, or has been placed in that posture before he expired; if he has washed, or caused to be washed, in hot water the body of a dead person, and interred him in a new shroud, with hose, shirt, and a mantle, and placed a piece of money in his mouth; if he has uttered a discourse in praise of the dead, or recited melancholy verses; if he has emptied the pitchers and other vessels of water in the house of the dead person, or in those of his neighbours, according to the custom of the Jews; if he sits behind the door of the deceased as a sign of grief, or eats fish and olives instead of meat, to honour his memory; if he remains in his house one year after the death of any one, to prove his grief.” . . . “ On the 6th of January, 1481, six persons were burnt,

seventeen on the 26th of March following, and a still greater number a month after; on the 4th of November, the same year, two hundred and ninety-eight *New Christians* had suffered the punishment of burning, and seventy-nine were condemned to the horrors of perpetual imprisonment, in the town of Seville alone. In other parts of the province and in the diocese of Cadiz, two thousand of these unfortunate creatures were burnt; according to Mariana, a still greater number were burnt in effigy, and one thousand seven hundred suffered different canonical punishments."—pp. 35, 36, 37.

It was in 1483 that Father Thomas de Torquemada, a Dominican and prior of the monastery of the Holy Cross at Segovia, was appointed the first Grand Inquisitor General of Spain. His name was most appropriate to his office, (perhaps it sounds still more so in Latin, *de Turrecrematâ*,) and it must be admitted that the Inquisition has frequently been lucky in the same way: thus we meet with Philip de Barbaris, as Inquisitor of Sicily; Gaspard Juglar, of Saragossa; Philip de Clemente, as Prothonotary of Arragon; Ximenez de Cinazas, as a Commissioner, and Cardinal de Judice, as Grand Inquisitor. Torquemada drew up the first *instructions* of the Spanish tribunal; they consisted of twenty-eight articles, and their general spirit may be deduced from the fifteenth.

"If a semi-proof existed against a person who denied his crime, he was to be put to the torture; if he confessed his crime during the torture, and afterwards confirmed his confession, he was punished as convicted; if he retracted he was tortured again, or condemned to an extraordinary punishment."—p. 41.

A few of Señor Llorente's observations on the mode of procedure by which examinations were regulated, will show how little chance there was that a prisoner should escape if he once fell within the toils of the Holy Office. Thus neither the accused nor the witnesses were ever informed of the cause of their citation; they often, therefore, stated circumstances entirely foreign to the subject of inquiry. On these they were interrogated as if they formed the main accusation; so that accidental depositions served as fresh denunciations, and, upon these, new processes were commenced. All tribunals, in connection with that before which a prisoner was cited, were required to furnish against him any accusation which might chance to exist on their registers; and if one and the same charge was represented by different Courts in different terms, (as it scarcely ever could happen otherwise,) each separate representation was adduced as a distinct charge. The same practice was adopted with witnesses, and if a single conversation was related in a different manner by any given number of persons, the charge formed upon this testimony appeared to indi-

cate that the accused had expressed himself heretically on as many different occasions as there were witnesses against him. Hence the prisoner often imagined that he was accused of a great number of crimes, and if he answered one article in a different manner from another, (not perceiving that the facts were identical,) he was deemed guilty of contradiction and falsehood in his replies. Even if he confessed all that the witnesses deposed, he might still be subjected to the question; and although Señor Llorente has wisely abstained from disgusting his readers by particular representation of the severity of torture, he nevertheless affirms, that none of the accounts already given by others can be taxed with exaggeration. If the prisoner selected a lawyer for his defence, this advocate was neither allowed to see the original process, nor to communicate with his client. The sentence, be it what it might, was never communicated to the condemned till the commencement of execution: when those destined to the stake were given over to the secular arm, and *relaxed*, and those who were to be *reconciled* by different penances were attired in the *san benito*, with a paper mitre on their heads, a cord round their necks, and a wax taper in their hands. The *san benito* was a corruption of *sacco bendito*, (the blessed vest of penitence,) it was a close tunic, like a Priest's cassock, with crosses of a different colour on the breast, and in Spanish was properly named *zamarra*. St. Dominic and the original Inquisitors kindly gave it as a protecting badge to reconciled heretics, at a time when all who were suspected of heresy were indiscriminately massacred, even if unarmed, by the fury of the Papists.

A decree of the Cortes in 1518 abolished the punishment of perpetual imprisonment as inflicted by the Inquisition, and this for a reason of some considerable weight, "because the prisoners die of hunger and cannot serve God;" but the code which contained the regulations was never ratified, and Cardinal Adrian, the tutor of Charles V., and the successful rival of our own Wolsey for the Papacy, increased the severity of the existing laws. Philip II., forty years afterwards, issued that fearful ordinance, by which death and confiscation became the portion of any one who dared to sell, buy, keep or read books prohibited by the Holy Office; and the *Indices expurgatoriæ* were framed on such vague principles, that we find that of the Inquisitor General, Don Gaspard de Quiroga, in 1582, prohibiting the Index of Valdes his predecessor in the same ministry; while that of Valdes himself forbids all Hebrew books, and such in other languages as treat of Jewish customs, together with all sermons, writings, letters and discourses whatever on the Christian Religion, its mysteries, sacraments, and the Holy Scriptures, provided they were in manuscript.

Sorcery appears to have attracted great attention from the Inquisition, and Señor Lorente has presented us with the adventures of a celebrated magician, Doctor Eugene Torralva, a physician of Cuença, whom Cervantes has immortalized in the adventure of the *Dolorida*. “*No hagas tal,*” says Don Quixote to Sancho, while both were bestriding Clavileño, *ny acuérdate del verdadero cuento del Licenciado Torralva, á quien llevaron los Diablos en volandas por el ayre caballero en una caña, cerrados los ojos, y en doce horas llegó á Roma, y se apeó en Torre de Nona, que es una calle de la ciudad y vió todo el fracaso, asalto, y muerte de Borbon, y por la mañana yá estaban de vuelta en Madrid, donde dió cuenta de todo lo que havia visto: el qual asimismo dexo, que quando iba por el ayre, le mandó el Diablo que abriese los ojos, y los abrió, y se vió tan cerca, á su parecer, del cuerpo de la luna, que la pudiera asin con la mano y que no osó mirar la tierra por no desvanecerse.*” ii. 94.

Torralva, when examined by the Inquisition, stated, that in the beginning of the sixteenth century, he formed, at Rome, an intimate acquaintance with a Dominican, named Brother Peter.

“This man told him one day, that he had in his service one of the good angels, whose name was *Zequiel*, so powerful in the knowledge of the future, that no other could equal him; but that he abhorred the practice of obliging men to make a compact with him; that he was always free, and only served the person who placed confidence in him through friendship, and that he allowed him to reveal the secrets he communicated, but that any constraint employed to force him to answer questions made him for ever abandon the society of the man to whom he had attached himself. Brother Peter asked him if he would not like to have *Zequiel* for his friend, adding that he could obtain that favour on account of the friendship which subsisted between them; Torralva expressed the greatest desire to become acquainted with the Spirit of Brother Peter.”

“*Zequiel* soon appeared in the shape of a young man, fair, with flaxen hair, dressed in flesh colour, with a black surtout; he said to Torralva, *I will belong to thee as long as thou livest, and will follow thee wherever thou goest.* After this promise *Zequiel* appeared to Torralva at the different quarters of the moon, and whenever he wished to go from one place to another, sometimes in the figure of a traveller, sometimes like a hermit. *Zequiel* never spoke against the Christian religion, or advised him to commit any bad action; on the contrary, he reproached him when he committed a fault, and attended the church service with him; he always spoke in Latin or Italian, although he was with Torralva in Spain, France, and Turkey; he continued to visit him during his imprisonment but seldom, and did not reveal any secrets to him, and Torralva desired the spirit to leave him, because he caused agitation and prevented him from sleeping, but this did not prevent him from returning and relating things which wearied him.”—p. 134.

Torralva received fees for some cures which he had performed

through herbs, the secret virtues of which had been revealed to him by his Familiar, and Zequiël on this account reproached him for his avarice. Occasionally, however, when the physician, thus debarred from legitimate practice, became sad from want of money, he found six ducats at a time lying in his chamber; but Zequiël, when questioned, would not acknowledge that he had supplied them.

“The Cardinal de Santa Cruz, in 1516, commissioned Torralba to pass a night with his physician, Doctor Morales, in the house of a Spanish Lady named *Rosales*, to ascertain if what this woman related of a phantom, which she saw every night in the form of a murdered man, was to be believed; Doctor Morales had remained a whole night in the house, and had not seen any thing, when the Spanish lady announced the presence of the ghost, and the Cardinal hoped to discover something by means of Torralba. At the hour of one, the woman uttered her cry of alarm; Morales saw nothing, but Torralba perceived the figure, which was that of a dead man, behind him appeared another phantom with the features of a woman. Torralba said to him with a loud voice, *What dost thou seek here?* The phantom replied, *a treasure*, and disappeared. Zequiël, on being questioned, replied, that under the house there was the body of a man who had been assassinated with a poignard.”—p. 136.

The voyage to Rome is related much in the same manner by Señor Llorente, as by Cervantes, save that the *sea* is substituted for the *moon*, much to the detriment of the sublimity of the narrative. The rumours which this marvellous journey occasioned, led to Torralva's denunciation. He confessed all that has been related concerning Zequiël, but wisely confined to his bosom certain doubts which he had elsewhere expressed respecting the immortality of the Soul and the divinity of our Saviour; nevertheless the Council decreed that he should be tortured, “as much as his age and rank permitted.” The points sought to be discovered were these; why he communicated with Zequiël? Whether he believed him to be a bad angel? Whether he had made a compact with him? if so, what was its nature? and whether he had invoked him at first, or afterwards, by any conjuration? The rack induced him to admit that he *now* believed the Spirit to be a bad angel, because he had brought him into misfortune; but he continued to deny the existence of any compact. The trial was suspended for one year, and

“On the 6th of March, 1531, Torralba was condemned to the usual abjuration of all heresies, and to suffer the punishment of imprisonment and the *san-benito* during the pleasure of the inquisitor-general; to hold no further communion with the spirit Zequiël, and never to attend to any of his propositions; these conditions were imposed on him for the safety of his conscience and the good of his soul.”—p. 140.

The Admiral of Castile, however, soon procured a remission

of Torralva's punishment, and retained him as his physician. His adventures have been introduced into different parts of the *Carlos Famoso*, a poem written by Louis Zapate, in 1566.

Another remarkable prisoner, during the seventeenth century, was Juan Perez de Saavedra, a native of Cordova. His father was a military officer, and Saavedra, who early exhibited marks of considerable ability, employed it like Chatterton, to perfect himself in the art of forgery. His first experiments were harmless, but they soon assumed a less ambiguous character, and by counterfeited Papal Bulls, Royal ordinances, Letters of change, and various signatures, he passed himself for a Knight Commander of the military order of St. Jago, and received the salary, amounting to three thousand ducats, for a year and a half. Other similar means produced him the large sum of 360,000 ducats, and his ingenious villany might have descended undiscovered to the grave, if ambition had not prompted him to a flight, scarcely paralleled in daring and extravagance. He forged a Bull from Pope Paul III., and letters bearing the signatures of Charles V. and Prince Philip, his son, to John III. King of Portugal, earnestly requesting him to establish the Inquisition in his dominions. Passing to Seville he hired a large train of attendants, bought litters and plate, and announced himself as a Cardinal Legate, *a latere*, from the Apostolical See. In that city he was received with marked distinction for eighteen days, and having announced his approach to the Court of Lisbon, he was met on the frontier with all due honours, and conducted to the Capital, in which, during three months, he successfully maintained the delusion. But the mask, however skilfully worn, could not be supported for ever. We are not informed of the particular facts which led to his detection; but while he was engaged on a tour through the several Dioceses of the kingdom, he was entrapped and arrested by the Familiars of the Spanish Inquisition. He was sentenced to ten years service in the galleys, wherein, however, he passed altogether, not less than nineteen; for the Alcaldes of Madrid refused to grant his release until they were compelled to accord it by a Papal Brief, which this arch-swindler had dexterity enough to procure, by representing that he had done several things extremely useful to Religion and the State, in the exercise of his false legation. In 1562, he was presented to Philip II. and the narrative which he related to that Monarch, was written down as he delivered it by Antonio Perez. Five years afterwards, Saavedra himself composed a similar history for the Inquisitor General.

But by far the most extraordinary case which was ever supposed to have been submitted to the authority of the Inquisition, both as respects the station or the fate of the culprit, is that of the miserable Don Carlos—miserable, whether we regard him as

the victim of his own evil and depraved passions, or of the vindictive jealousy of a cruel father. Señor Llorente professes to have examined the archives of the Holy Office with the closest care; and from these he affirms that Don Carlos was neither tried nor condemned by the Inquisition, as all former narratives have asserted; that an opinion was given against him by the Council of State, of which the Inquisitor-general was President; a circumstance which may have occasioned the very general error; and that he perished in the end through a verbal sentence approved by his father. The stipulation that Don Carlos should marry Isabella of France was inserted, as a secret article, in a treaty concluded when the Prince was as yet not more than thirteen years of age; and there is reason, as Señor Llorente concludes, to suppose that he never was acquainted with this design; nor has he found in the MSS. which he has consulted any fact which may justify the belief that he was ever, in point of fact, in love with his stepmother. His disposition, even from boyhood, seems to have been marked by an insane ferocity, which led him to amuse himself, in very early years, by cutting the throats of young rabbits, and watching their expiring agonies. This instinctive perversion was increased by a severe fall, which injured the spine and head, when he was about seventeen years of age. His vices were confirmed by manhood, and he occasionally broke out into furious and indecent bursts of passion, which led to acts of extravagant and brutal violence. He often struck his servants, and on one occasion, his bootmaker having brought home a pair of boots which were too small, they were cut in pieces by the Prince's order, cooked, and forced down the unhappy cobbler's throat, to the great danger of his life. He attempted (and it would have been fortunate for humanity if he had succeeded) to stab the Duke d' Alva; and, in the end, when a marriage was proposed between him and his cousin, Anne of Austria, dissatisfied with the tardiness of the preliminary negociation, he projected (like our own Charles I.) a secret visit to Germany, in order to accelerate the nuptials—a fact (if it be such) which would effectually disprove his accredited love for his stepmother. The persons to whom he applied for money, that he might compass this wild project, awakened in him thoughts of more ambitious tendency. They promised to declare him chief Governor of the Low Countries, and, in the end, kindled in his mind the atrocious hope of compassing his father's assassination. So incautiously, however, did he proceed, and so indiscriminately and openly did he communicate his guilty intentions, that Philip was early apprized of them. The following account of the Prince's arrest is given from the narrative of one of his ushers, written a few days after it had taken place.

"The prince, my master," says he, "had been for some days unable to take a moment's rest; he was continually repeating that he wished to kill a man whom he hated. He informed Don John of Austria of his design, but concealed the name of the person. The king went to the Escorial, and sent for Don John. The subject of their conversation is not known; but was supposed to be concerning the prince's sinister designs. Don John, doubtless, revealed all he knew. The king soon after sent post for the Doctor Velasco; he spoke to him of his plans, and the works at the Escorial, gave his orders, and added that he should not return immediately. At this time happened the day of jubilee, which the court was in the habit of gaining at Christmas; the prince went on the Saturday evening to the Convent of St. Jerome. I was in attendance about his person. His royal highness confessed at the convent, but could not obtain absolution, on account of his evil intentions. He applied to another confessor, who also refused. The prince said to him, '*Decide more quickly.*' The monk replied, '*Let your highness cause this case to be discussed by learned men.*' It was eight o'clock in the evening; the prince sent his carriage for the theologians of the convent of *Atocha*. Fourteen came, two and two; he sent us to Madrid to fetch the monks Albarado, one an Augustine, the other a Maturin; he disputed with them all, and obstinately persisted in desiring to be absolved, always repeating that he hated a man until he had killed him. All these monks declaring that it was impossible to comply with the prince's request, he then wished that they should give him an unconsecrated wafer, that the court might believe that he had fulfilled the same duties as the rest of the royal family. This proposal threw the monks into the greatest consternation. Many other delicate points were discussed in this conference, which I am not permitted to repeat. Every thing went wrong; the prior of the Convent of *Atocha* took the prince aside, and endeavoured to learn the quality of the person he wished to kill. He replied that he was a man of very high rank, and said no more. At last the prior deceived him, saying, '*My Lord, tell me what man it is; it may, perhaps, be possible to give you absolution according to the degree of satisfaction your highness wishes to take.*' The prince then declared that it was the king, his father, whom he hated, and that he would have his life. The prior then said, calmly, '*Does your highness intend to kill the king yourself, or to employ some person to do it?*' The prince persisted so firmly in his resolution, that he could not obtain absolution, and lost the jubilee. This scene lasted until two hours after midnight; all the monks retired overwhelmed with sorrow, particularly the prince's confessor. The next day I accompanied the prince on his return to the palace, and information was sent to the king of all that had passed.

"The monarch repaired to Madrid on Saturday; the next day he went to hear mass in public, accompanied by his brother and the princes. Don John, who was ill with vexation, went to visit Don Carlos on that day, who ordered the doors to be shut, and asked him what had been the subject of his conversation with the king. Don John replied that it was about the gallies. The prince asked him many questions to find out something more, and when he found that his uncle would not be more

explicit, he drew his sword. Don John retreated to the door; finding it shut, he stood on his defence, and said, '*Stop, your highness.*' Those who were outside having heard him, opened the doors, and Don John retired to his hotel. The prince, feeling, indisposed, went to bed, where he remained till six in the evening; he then rose and put on a dressing-gown. As he was still fasting at eight o'clock, he sent for a boiled capon; at half-past nine he again retired to bed. I was on duty on that day also, and I supped in the palace.

"At eleven o'clock I saw the king descending the stairs; he was accompanied by the Duke de Feria, the grand prior, the lieutenant-general of the guards, and twelve of his men: the king wore arms over his garments, and had a helmet on; he walked towards the door where I was; I was ordered to shut it, and not to open it to any person whatever. These persons were already in the prince's chamber, when he cried, '*Who is there?*' The officers went to the head of his bed, and seized his sword and dagger. The Duke de Feria took an arquebuse loaded with two balls. The prince, having uttered cries and menaces, was told, '*The Council of State is present.*' He endeavoured to seize his arms, and to make use of them; he had already jumped out of bed when the king entered. His son then said to him, '*What does your majesty want with me?*' '*You will soon know,*' replied the king. The doors and windows were fastened; the king told Don Carlos to remain quietly in that apartment until he received further orders; he then called the Duke de Feria, and said, '*I give the prince into your care, that you may guard him and take care of him:*' then addressing Louis Quijada, the Count de Lerma, and Don Rodrigo de Mendoza, he said to them, '*I commission you to serve and amuse the prince; do not do anything he commands you without first informing me. I order you all to guard him faithfully, on pain of being declared traitors.*' At these words the prince began to utter loud cries, and said, '*You had much better kill me, than keep me a prisoner; it is a great scandal to the kingdom: if you do not do it, I shall know how to kill myself.*' The king replied, '*that he must take care not to do so, because such acts were only committed by madmen.*' The prince said, '*Your majesty treats me so ill, that you will force me to come to that extremity, either from madness or desperation.*' Some other conversation passed between them, but nothing was decided on, because neither the time nor place permitted it."—pp. 390—394.

During his confinement Don Carlos manifested the greatest impatience. He refused to confess; and was so irregular in his meals and repose that a perpetual fever preyed upon him. He put ice in his bed to temper the insupportable heat and dryness of his skin. He walked about naked for whole nights, and during eleven days refused any sustenance, only drinking immoderately of iced-water, which failed to relieve his burning thirst. A malignant fever and dysentery was the consequence of this rashness. Meantime the king created a special Commission for the examination of the case. He himself presided, and his assessors were Cardinal Espinosa, the Inquisitor-general; the Prince of

Evoli; and Don Diego Bribiesca de Muñatones, a Councillor of Castile. These Commissioners condemned the unhappy Prince to death, for having attempted parricide and treason; but they added, at the same time, that general laws might be suspended in causes affecting the Blood Royal, and that, for the good of his subjects, the King might commute the punishment. Philip, however, affected the Roman Father. He opposed his conscience to his heart, (the real balance would have been nicely adjusted) and stating that it would be most unfortunate for his Kingdom if it were to be governed by a King "devoid of knowledge, talent, judgment, and virtue, full of vices and passions, and above all, furious, ferocious, and sanguinary," he resolved upon permitting the laws to take their course, (a most convenient expression whenever an act of cruelty is to be perpetrated) "notwithstanding his attachment to his son and his anguish at so terrible a sacrifice." The conclusion of the Tragedy is well known, although the precise manner by which the catastrophe was brought about has been differently represented. The King suggested that, from the state of health in which the Prince then was, there could be little *hope* of prolonging his life, and that it would be right to suffer him to commit some excess in eating and drinking which would produce his death. Before this took place, however, due care for his salvation imperiously required that he should confess and be absolved. The Prince of Evoli was commissioned so to express himself to Olivarez, the attendant physician, that he could not mistake the part which he was expected to perform. Olivarez accordingly administered a medicine which, in the expressive words of Louis Cabrera, (Hist. Philip II. vii.) a contemporary employed in the palace, "did not produce any beneficial effect, and the malady appeared mortal." Don Carlos confessed; three days after the King visited him, twice *gave him his blessing, and retired weeping*, and on the morning of the fourth the Prince expired.

There is little of interest in the remainder of this volume. The passion for *autos-da-fé*, as public amusements, continued to a late season. The new Queen, Elizabeth de Valois, daughter of Henry II. of France, was entertained with one of these celebrations on her first arrival in Spain, in 1560, when she was no more than thirteen years of age; and in 1680, when Charles II. married Maria Louisa de Bourbon, nineteen miserable wretches expired in the flames in testimony of the national joy. Soon after Diaz, the Bishop elect of Avila, the royal confessor, was accused of having consulted *dæmons*. Charles II. had been unsuccessfully exorcised by Diaz; for his failure in progeny was gravely supposed to be the result of *dæmoniacal* possession. But a rival

conjuror extorted from the foul fiend an admission that a spell had been put upon the king, because the holy sacrament was left in the church without lamps or wax candles, and the communities of monks were dying of hunger; and Diaz, in order to unbewitch his master, redoubled his incantations. This was the basis of a subsequent charge from which he escaped by flight.

In 1732 Donna Aguida, a lady of noble birth, and of great reputation for sanctity, expired under the torture. The charges against her were infanticide and compact with the devil; and of the truth of one of these, at least, very adequate proofs seem to have been adduced. Still later, in 1781, a Nun was burned for a similar diabolical connection. She was the last person who was committed to the flames by the Inquisition. In 1808 Buonaparte decreed the suppression of this tribunal: in 1813 the Cortes-General of Spain renewed the decree as on their own authority; and in the following year, one of the first measures after the return and restoration of our then faithful ally, Ferdinand, was the re-establishment of the Holy Office in its former power and privileges.

We shall add, in conclusion, Señor Llorente's calculation of the number of victims whom the Inquisition has sacrificed. From the *data* on which he professes to have formed them, they by no means demand implicit assent. The first statement, however, is furnished by the parties themselves, and, horrible as it is, its truth therefore must be admitted. In the Castle of Triana, at Seville, wherein the Inquisitorial tribunal was held, an inscription, erected in 1524, imports that between that year and 1492 about 1000 persons had been burned, and 20,000 condemned to various penances. In the four years of the Marian persecution 288 persons were burned; so that Gardiner and Bonuer exceeded Torquemada in zeal by a ratio of more than two to one. During the 300 years from 1481 to 1781, 31,912 heretics are said to have perished in the flames—and, adding to this period the years up to the present time, 17,639 effigies have been burned, representing such criminals as the Inquisition could not catch for more substantial vengeance—and 291,456 have been condemned to severe penances. Such are the fruits of that Persuasion which we are required to admit into a free participation of power, and the reinstatement of which in the means of offence among ourselves, we are considered narrow-minded, bigoted, and illiberal for continuing to oppose.

ART. X.—1. *Précis du Système Hiéroglyphique des anciens Egyptiens, ou Recherches sur les élémens premiers de cette écriture sacrée, sur les diverses combinaisons, et sur les rapports de ce système avec les autres méthodes graphiques Egyptiennes.* Par M. Champollion le Jeune. Avec un volume de planches (lithographiées). A Paris. 1824. 1 vol. large 8vo. 16. 4to. 32 plates.

2. *Lettres à M. le Duc de Blacas d'Aulps, Pair de France, &c. relatives au Musée royal Egyptien de Turin.* Par le même. Première Lettre—Monuments Historiques. A Paris. 1824. Large 8vo. pp. 109. Three Plates.

3. *Deuxième Lettre.* A Paris. 1826. Plates 4—16.

WHOEVER has experienced the pleasure felt by a traveller as he watches the dispersion of the mist which conceals the valley beneath him; and sees one almost uniform blank suddenly replaced by all the variety of hill and dale; lawn and forest; tranquil pools and rapid torrents;—will be aware of the sensation produced,—though in a very different degree,—by a perusal of the works named above. Most readers will probably feel much disappointment on first looking into them, especially such as are unprepared by an acquaintance with the able essay on hieroglyphics contained in the Supplement to the Encyclopædia Britannica. Finding much that looks like gratuitous hypothesis, vague conjecture, and unwarranted inference, they will be tempted to lay the book aside in despair, and conclude, that M. Champollion's system, though less extravagant than Kircher's, and more definite than Palin's, has no *point d'appui*, no fixed point, nothing, in short, which is so immoveable as to afford a firm basis for further speculations. On a closer examination, however, this method of interpreting the hieroglyphics will appear in a very different light, and so many unexpected coincidences will occur, so many independent evidences arise, all tending to the same point and leading to the same conclusions, that the most sceptical will be compelled to acknowledge, with the Italian proverb, "*Se non e vero, e ben trovato!*" It is indeed as much in the results of M. Champollion's researches, as in the system itself, that its probability is manifested, and for that reason the tracts named at the head of this Article, have been added to his *Précis du Système Hiéroglyphique*. The full merit of the latter could hardly be shown without some notice of the former. While the one unfolds his method of interpretation and gives the theory of

his doctrine, the other shows its practical application and the value of the knowledge obtained by it.

M. Champollion's book naturally divides itself into three parts; 1. An 'Introduction,' pointing out the object and extent of his work (i. 1—12.); 2. A developement of the observations which form the basis of his system (ch. i.—viii. pp. 12—251.); 3. The system itself, illustrated by its application to a considerable number of hieroglyphical inscriptions, which are thus, either wholly or partially, explained (ch. ix. x. pp. 251—400.) From his Introduction it will not be necessary to extract any thing more than the substance of the six Propositions by which it is terminated. Its object is, in fact, to demonstrate the inadmissibility of some unguarded expressions dropped by a writer in the *Quarterly Review*; (Oct. 1822. No. LV. pp. 188. 192, 193)—a point so manifest to all persons not blinded by precipitation and dogmatism, that M. Champollion might perhaps have spared himself some trouble without doing any injury to his cause. He also wishes to point out where he has gone beyond Dr. Young in the application and enlargement of the views which that learned and acute scholar first developed, and to show the universality of the method of representing *sounds* by *images*, first discovered from its application to the expression of names foreign to the Egyptians. The six propositions mentioned above are as follows:—

1. That the hieroglyphical alphabet was used to express royal names and titles in every age.

2. That the *phonetic* alphabet is the true key to the whole system of hieroglyphics.

3. That it was used by the Egyptians at all periods, to express words as well as names in their own language.

4. That all hieroglyphical inscriptions contain a great number of words so expressed.

5. That characters belonging to different classes were used simultaneously in such inscriptions; and

6. That from all the preceding propositions a general theory of the hieroglyphical system of writing may be deduced.

The first five of these propositions are merely an introduction to the sixth, and from these the first eight chapters of the *Précis* are derived. Being aware that analysis is more agreeable in a new and disputable doctrine than synthesis, M. Champollion has judiciously begun by giving a short view of the progress of this branch of study (chap. i. 12—38), and shows its results first (1) in the discovery of Greek and Latin proper names (chap. ii. 38—49) expressed in hieroglyphics; then (2) by deducing an alphabet from them, and ascertaining that some were strictly *ideogra-*

phic (ch. iii. 49—65), while others were invariably phonetic, he next proves (3) that the particles, terminations, and other grammatical forms of the Egyptian language, were expressed phonetically (chap. iv. 66—83); that (4) in the vernacular names some hieroglyphics were the actual images, others only the symbols of the idea expressed (chap. v. vi. 84—130); that (5) the same was the case with respect to the titles given to gods and princes (chap. vii. 131—172); and (6) that the names and titles even of the Pharaohs were expressed by the same method. (chap. viii. 172—251.) A considerable portion of this introduction is polemical, for the author is very desirous of proving that he has borrowed little, if anything, from the lucubrations of Dr. Young. By his extreme courteousness he has almost disarmed criticism, and though there is no reason to dispute his having in many cases anticipated that learned and acute writer's discoveries, it may be doubted whether he is altogether willing to do him entire justice any more than he was in another work, (*L'Egypte sous les Pharaons*, i. xxv.) to deal quite fairly with an adversary who complained of a parallel injudiciously drawn by one of his friends.* Though all this part of the work is illustrated by pertinent examples, and gives scope to a variety of interesting remarks, yet, as it is only introductory, and the most important portion of it, that which relates to the names of the Pharaohs, has been already noticed in a former article, (*British Critic*, Oct. 1825. No. I. p. 87—94) it will be most proper now to pass on to the concluding chapters, (ch. ix. 251—366. ch. x. 366—400), and give as large an abstract, as our limits will allow, of the “*Elements of the Hieroglyphic System of Writing*,” which they contain.

M. Champollion's first inquiry (§ i. 253—258) is directed to “the forms of” the “signs” by which the Egyptians expressed their ideas. Of these the most ancient and obvious were with them, as with the Chinese and Mexicans, *images* of the things signified; but *visible* objects alone could be thus represented; those which fall under the other senses, and most especially *abstract* ideas, could only be expressed by *symbols* derived from such images; hence arose the different classes into which the hieroglyphical characters, on an attentive examination, naturally fall. These classes are distinctly pointed out by M. Champollion; but he first notices the different degrees of perfection with which the hieroglyphics are executed (§ ii. 258—263); their

* See *Observations sur quelques points de la Géographie de l'Egypte*, (Paris, 1812,) by M. Etienne Quatremère, Greek Professor at Rouen, whose Coptic Lexicon, it is to be hoped, will not be longer withheld from the public.

probable numbers, as far as can yet be ascertained, (§ iii. 263—268) and the various directions in which they are placed. (§ iv. 268—272.)

With regard to style of execution, the hieroglyphics may be also subdivided into five different orders:—1. *pure* hieroglyphics, which are distinct images of the objects represented: 2. *umbratic* hieroglyphics, which are mere outlines sunk into the stone, in order to be filled with paste or enamel: 3. *profiles*, or similar outlines, drawn or scratched with a graver, and filled up with some uniform colour: 4. *linear* hieroglyphics, a reduction of those in the last class to an imperfect sketch or hint of the thing signified: 5. the *hieratic* character, or short-hand hieroglyphics; forming a mere memorandum of the implied image, and bearing the same relation to it as the present Chinese character does to the original forms of the Syang-hing, or “images” used in the earliest ages: 6. the *demotic*, or popular hand, an abbreviation even of the hieratic character, to which it bears a close resemblance, though it often happens that scarcely any vestige of the fundamental hieroglyphic can be traced. Nothing, indeed, but a minute comparison of corresponding texts in all these different styles, could convince any one of their filiation, and it was, we believe, by such a process that Dr. Young (to whom alone that discovery is due)—(*Hieroglyph. Lit.* p. 14.) ascertained the fact, that the Egyptians had no alphabetic character whatever; and that the *epistolographic* or *demotic*, as well as the *hieratic*, were merely compendious abridgments of the hieroglyphics. M. Champollion has very properly added a plate, containing the same text expressed in all these different characters, except the last: the identical symbols, however, do not always recur, equivalents, as is the case in all corresponding texts, being occasionally substituted. The three first of these orders are merely varieties of the true hieroglyphics; the fourth is considered as the *hieratic* by Dr. Young, and the fifth, which he calls *enchorial*, is that so named on the Rosetta stone, whence all certain knowledge of these characters is derived. The sixth, which is not mentioned by M. Champollion in this place, is found in deeds and other documents preserved with mummies, and approaches so near to the 5th, that it may be doubted whether they are really distinct.

The number of hieroglyphic characters absolutely differing from each other, has been variously estimated, and, as M. Champollion observes, cannot possibly be determined till most of the inscriptions in those characters have been copied. His own observations led to the following results:—

Of hieroglyphics representing

(1) Heavenly bodies, there are	10	(10) Insects	14
(2) Man	120	(11) Vegetables	60
(3) Limbs of the human body	60	(12) Houses, &c.	24
(4) Wild beasts	24	(13) Furniture, &c.	100
(5) Domestic animals	10	(14) Dress and accoutrements	80
(6) Limbs of beasts	22	(15) Tools and utensils	150
(7) Birds, and limbs of birds	50	(16) Cups, vessels, &c.	30
(8) Fish	10	(17) Geometrical figures	20
(9) Reptiles	30	(18) Monsters	50
	336		528

So that the whole amounts only to 864, which is probably much below the truth. With regard to the place of these figures, great freedom seems to have been allowed. They might be arranged either perpendicularly or horizontally, from right to left, or from left to right; but the latter is the most prevalent order; and as the figures always look towards the side where the inscription begins, they show the direction in which it must be read: care was also taken to leave no gaps, so that the smaller figures are often arranged in vertical groups, though the whole line is horizontal.

The classes under which the various kinds of hieroglyphics may be distributed are thus enumerated:—(§ v. p. 271.) 1. The *primitive* or absolute hieroglyphics, called “figurative characters” by M. Champollion. (§ vi. 73—282.) 2. The *symbolical*, or relative hieroglyphics; (§ vii. 212—304.) and 3. The *phonetic* characters. The first, as before observed, are the images of the objects expressed; the second are the figures by which abstract ideas are metaphorically implied; and the third are used for the purpose of denoting sounds.

The symbols are of various kinds, and often enigmatical;—thus, two arms holding a bow and arrow, signify “a battle;”—a censer, with some grains of incense, “an act of adoration;”—a man throwing javelins, “an insurrection;”—a hair pencil, reed, pallet and ink-horn, denote painting, writing or letters. Sometimes a part was put for the whole, or vice versâ; at others, the symbol was quite arbitrary; as the beetle used for “paternity,” and “the world;” the vulture for “maternity;” and a cieling, or a woman placed in the position of a cieling, for “the heavens.” The symbols employed to represent the names of the deities were either human figures, with the heads of animals consecrated to those gods, or the animals themselves, bearing the peculiar insignia of the god whom they represented: the ram, for Ammon Cneph; the hawk crowned with a disk, for Ré or Phré; the ibis, for Thoth; the crocodile, for Suchis, &c. Some deities are also represented by symbols, the origin of which

is not so obvious; an eye over a throne, denotes Osiris; a Nilometer, Phtha, and an obelisk, Ammon.

But, by such symbols, the connexion and relations of the different parts of a sentence could not be determined; for that purpose a further expedient was necessary; and the Egyptians, like the Chinese, (Remusat, *Gram. Chinoise*, p. 4,) were compelled to devise some method of representing sounds, independently of the sense attached to them. The different character of their languages, however, occasioned a corresponding difference in their expedients for that purpose. The Chinese wanted nothing but single consonants, terminated by a simple or nasal vowel: the Egyptians, on the contrary, had monosyllables and dissyllables to represent, many of them beginning or ending by double consonants; so that while the former assumed the signs of well-known objects as the representatives of the whole monosyllables, by which those objects were named, the latter used similar signs to represent the initial sounds alone,* and had no need of the adjunct required by the Chinese to indicate the peculiar office of such characters. The hieroglyphics appropriated to this purpose have been denominated by M. Champollion, "phonetic;" and the discovery of their being universally applied, certainly constitutes his great merit. Dr. Young had observed the coincidence of certain hieroglyphics with some of the Coptic particles, (Append. to Belzoni's *Travels*, 491—507) and the resemblance between the corresponding enchorial characters and the letters which form those particles; he, therefore, here, as elsewhere, laid the foundation on which the author of the *Précis* has, with so much skill, raised his superstructure. But our learned and acute countryman does not seem to have ever supposed that other significant words in the Egyptian language were expressed by these picture-letters, and for the knowledge of that fact we are indebted to the work before us.

Zoëga, one of the ablest and most learned of modern writers on the literature of ancient Egypt, has shown that the concurrent testimony of the classic authors seems to prove that the Egyptians used an alphabetical character. (*De Origine et Usu Obelisc*, 556—558.) The passages which he cites allude, no doubt, to the demotic, or enchorial character, which suggests, at first sight, the idea of letters similar to those of the Phœnicians and other Asiatic nations; and the error into which his authorities had fallen may be compared

* If a Chinese wished to express the pronunciation of *vang*, he would write "cut vû, shang;" i. e. cut off the v of vû, and the ang of shang, and put them together in order to form vang. In many compound words also, some of the component parts have been added merely to show the pronunciation, but in these cases no such indication is added: thus the characters for cypress are Pe-tree, signifying not white tree, but the tree named Pé,

with another, to which they also gave birth, viz. that images or symbols alone were expressed by the hieroglyphics. Both originated in the slight and perfunctory manner, in which questions respecting the literature of foreign nations were examined by the Greeks and Romans. (p. 320, 321.) The more closely we compare Egyptian texts, evidently containing the same subjects, expressed for the most part in the same words, the more distinctly is it manifested that the demotic or enchorial characters correspond exactly with the hieroglyphics; and, that when there is any discrepancy between them, it is not occasioned by the use of another letter, but by the equivalent of another hieroglyphic representing the same letter. For, as, according to the plan mentioned above, any common object, of which the name began by the sound required, might be taken to represent that sound; the variety of such representatives would be almost unlimited, and the texts thus expressed would be as truly a series of images as those in which the real, or symbolical representations of the things signified were employed. It was, perhaps, this license, as to the literal hieroglyphics, that occasioned the obscurity under which the Egyptian doctrines were sometimes veiled: but in ordinary cases, this change of imagery occasioned no difficulty to the reader—the name of the figures represented immediately recurred to his recollection, and whether it were a *mouth* or a *pomegranate*, it equally reminded him of the initial *r* in *ro*, and *roman*. The variety of such signs, moreover, does not seem to have been very great: five-and-twenty (the hieroglyphics representing *S*) is the largest number yet ascertained as belonging to the same letter; and these might be reduced without much difficulty to seventeen: so that the Egyptian character was doubtless both read and written with much more facility than the Chinese, the real difficulty of which has, moreover, been greatly over-rated.

That pictures, like those used by the Mexicans, were the prototypes of hieroglyphics, and that the addition of symbols was the next step in this method of expressing ideas, cannot be doubted; but at what time signs indicative of sounds were introduced, and the habit of abstraction had become so common as to suggest the combination of those signs for the purpose of supplying the place of oral language, it is impossible to determine. The most ancient Egyptian inscriptions, yet examined, consist of hieroglyphics of all the different orders, so that the system followed in the first ages of our era was already in common use, at least, twenty centuries before the beginning of that period. It is evident, also, that the phonetic characters belonged to an alphabetical system, similar to that of the Semitic dialects, in which all but the emphatic vowels are pronounced with great rapidity and very

indistinctly, and are, therefore, implied, but not expressed.* The use of a soft breathing, also, similar to the *alif* of the same family of languages, is another peculiarity which seems to give some colour to the hypothesis of M. Seyffarth, who maintains that the demotic is a corrupt form of the Phœnician alphabet, and that the hieroglyphics are an ornamental and mysterious mode of forming the same letters. That hypothesis, however, is not only built upon a gratuitous assumption, but is irreconcilable to many well established facts. The deficiency and uncertainty of the vowels marked in the phonetic alphabet, so far from affording any advantage to the opponents of M. Champollion's theory, are, in fact, a corroboration of its truth; for the Coptic, which is nothing more than the Egyptian language written in the Greek character—especially the Sâidic or Theban dialect of it—presents innumerable examples of the habitual suppression of medial vowels; and has an abundance of words formed of consonants alone.† The same hieroglyphics also equally mark the aspirated and unaspirated letters, and those which stand for *l* and *r* are used promiscuously; so that precisely the same sounds are indeterminate in the hieroglyphic alphabet, as are interchangeable in the Coptic; and the figured texts may be read off with equal ease in either of its three dialects, the Thebaïc, Memphitic, or Bashmuri; for *p*, *c* and *t* in the first, are replaced by the corresponding aspirates in the second; and *r* in the two first is changed into *l* by the third. The long vowels, also, are subject to much variation in these different dialects, just as the *a* in Arabic, is generally *o* or *u* in Hebrew, and *u* in Punic.‡

This abundance of different signs representing the same sound put it into the power of the Egyptians to select such as might convey a covert allusion to some peculiarity in the object expressed; and on this principle M. Champollion has ingeniously accounted for the use of some phonetic hieroglyphics in preference to others: thus *the ram* he thinks was used for *b* in Núb, (Chnubis or Cneph) rather than a *censer* or a *leg*, because the ram was the proper symbol of the god so named: the *vase*, also, was employed to denote the *N*, because he was figured with a *vase* at his feet. The *lion*, king of beasts, is used for *L* or *R* in names of *kings*; the *ram* stands for the *B* in “Tiberius” at Esná, because

* This implied vowel, called Fat'lah (the mere opening of the mouth) by the Hebrews and Arabs, is pronounced by the Persians and Indians like the *u* in our words, “shut, rut, cut.” It corresponds exactly with the *yet* of the Armenians, which is always substituted for every suppressed vowel, and is never expressed except where indispensably necessary.

† Such as *mn* “with;” and *mnt*, “attribute;” *rm*, “inhabitant;” *snt*, “to create;” *tm*, “to shut;” *stm*, “to hear;” *nth*, “thee,” &c.

‡ Head is *Ras*, Ar.; *Rosh*, Heb.; *Rus*, Punic.

Ammon Chnubis was the god to whom that temple was dedicated; the *censer* is put for the same letter in *sebastos*—which signifies “adorable,” “august.” In Roman names and titles, A is generally expressed by the eagle, (*akhôm*) the known emblem of the Roman power.

That the same word was usually expressed by the same symbols is also shown by another circumstance, first noticed, we believe, by M. Champollion; viz. that certain abbreviations are of common occurrence in the hieroglyphical texts. Sometimes the first and last phonetic character, or the first alone, is placed for the whole group. This is only done in common words, of frequent occurrence;—and what could be, *a priori*, more probable than the use of such abbreviations, when we see such extraordinary ones introduced into the legal documents of the Egyptians, drawn up in Greek? (See Young on Hieroglyph. Lond. 1823. p. 149).—This strong corroboration of M. Champollion’s doctrine with respect to these abbreviations, he has either overlooked or purposely left for others to point out.

As a summary of all his preceding remarks, he closes his eighth section (ch. 9. §. 8. p. 327) by observing, that there is no system of Egyptian characters either exclusively representative, ideographic, or phonetic; but that these three methods of expressing ideas were all intimately combined and used in the hieroglyphic texts, not only at the same time, but almost in the same word.

The testimony of the Greek and Roman writers, as was before observed, convinced Zoëga that the Egyptians possessed an alphabetic character; but if the demotic and hieratic were merely degradations of the hieroglyphic character, must not that testimony be set aside? Before an answer is given to this question, it will be well to notice what may be called the cardinal authority on this subject furnished by any Greek writer.—It is a passage from the *Stromata* of Clemens Alexandrinus, which appeared, to M. Champollion, to speak so clearly in favour of his theory, that he was afraid of trusting to his own interpretation, and therefore applied to M. Letronne, whose critical knowledge of the Greek language has been so clearly proved by his “*Recherches pour servir à l’histoire de l’Egypte*.”—Ἀντίκα οἱ παρ’ Αἰγυπτίοις παιδεύμενοι, says Clemens (*Strom.* V. 657. Ed. Potter), πρῶτον μὲν πάντων τὴν Αἰγυπτίων γραμμάτων μέθοδον ἐκμανθάνουσι, τὴν ἘΠΙΣΤΟΛΟΓΡΑΦΙΚΗΝ καλουμένην· δεύτερον δὲ, τὴν ἹΕΡΑΤΙΚΗΝ, ἣ χρωῶνται οἱ ἱερογραμματεῖς· ὑστάτην δὲ καὶ τελευταίαν τὴν ἹΕΡΟΓΛΥΦΙΚΗΝ, ἥς ἡ μὲν ἐστὶ διὰ τῶν ΠΡΩΤΩΝ ΣΤΟΙΧΕΙΩΝ ΚΥΡΙΟΛΟΓΙΚΗ; ἡ δὲ ΣΥΜΒΟΛΙΚΗ. Τῆς δὲ ΣΥΜΒΟΛΙΚΗΣ ἡ μὲν ΚΥΡΙΟΛΟΓΕΙΤΑΙ ΚΑΤΑ ΜΙΜΗΣΙΝ, ἡ δ’ ὥσπερ ΤΡΟΠΙΚΩΣ γράφεται, ἡ δ’ ἀντικρὺς ἀλληγορεῖται ΚΑΤΑ ΤΙΝΑΣ

ἌΙΝΙΓΜΟΥΣ. Ἦλιον γοῦν γράφαι βουλόμενοι κύκλον ποιῶσι, σελήνην δὲ σχῆμα μηνοειδὲς, ΚΑΤΑ ΤΟ ΚΥΡΙΟΛΟΥΜΕΝΟΝ ἜΙΔΟΣ· ΤΡΟΠΙΚΩΣ δὲ κατ' οἰκειότητα μετάγοντες καὶ μετατιθέντες, τὰ δ' ἐξαλλάττοντες, τὰ δὲ πολλαχῶς μετασχηματίζοντες χαράττουσιν. Τοὺς γοῦν τῶν βασιλέων ἐπαίνους θεολογουμένοις μύθοις παραδίδοντες ἀναγράφουσι διὰ τῶν ἈΝΑΓΛΥΦΩΝ. Τοῦ δὲ ΚΑΤΑ ΤΟΥΣ ἌΙΝΙΓΜΟΥΣ τρίτου εἶδους δεῖγμα ἔστω τόδε· τὰ μὲν γὰρ τῶν ἄλλων ἀστρων, διὰ τὴν πορείαν τὴν λοξὴν ὅφειν σάμασιν ἀπείκαζον, τὸν δὲ Ἦλιον τῷ τοῦ κανθάρου. This remarkable passage, which was strangely misunderstood by Warburton, though his sagacity showed him what it ought to signify, (Bailey, Hieroglyph. Origo et Natura. n. 1. p. 32), is thus rendered by M. Letronne : Ceux qui parmi les Egyptiens reçoivent de l'instruction, apprennent d'abord le genre d'écriture égyptienne qu'on appelle épistolographique : [ils apprennent] en second lieu l'hiératique, dont se servent les hiérogammates ; et enfin l'hiéroglyphique. L'hiéroglyphique [est de deux genres], l'un exprimant au propre les objets par LES LETTRES, l'autre les représentant par des symboles. L'hiéroglyphique SYMBOLIQUE [se subdivise en plusieurs espèces] : l'une représente les objets au propre par imitation ; l'autre les exprime tropiquement ; la troisième, au contraire, les rappelle au moyen de certaines allégories énigmatiques. Ainsi, d'après la méthode de représenter les objets au propre, les Egyptiens veulent-ils écrire le soleil, ils font un cercle ; la lune, ils tracent la figure d'un croissant. Dans la méthode tropique, ils représentent les objets au moyen d'analogies (ou de propriétés semblables), qu'ils transportent dans l'expression de ces objets, tantôt par des modifications [de forme], tantôt et plus souvent par des transformations totales. Ainsi, ils représentent par des anaglyphes [bas-reliefs allégoriques], les louanges de leurs rois, quand ils veulent les faire connaître au moyen de mythes religieux. Voici un exemple de la troisième espèce [d'écriture hiéroglyphique] qui emploie des allusions énigmatiques : les Egyptiens figurent les astres [planétaires] par un serpent, à cause de l'obliquité de leur course ; mais le soleil est figuré par un scarabée.

M. Letronne has shown in his commentary on this passage (Precis, 329—401.), that the three kinds of writing mentioned by Clemens, the epistolographic, hieratic, and hieroglyphic, correspond exactly with the two named by Herodotus, Diodorus and the Rosetta Inscription ; for the first, which “expressed objects as they are, without figure or metaphor, by means of the letters of the alphabet,” is manifestly the *demotic* of Herodotus and Diodorus, and the *enchorial* of the Rosetta Stone : the second and third, which are “the sacred letters” spoken of by the two historians, are the hieroglyphics of the Inscription. He also proves by a

passage from Plutarch (Symp. IX. 3) that by "the first letters of the alphabet," Clemens means those borrowed from the Phœnicians by Cadmus, which are the very letters for which M. Champollion's researches have found hieroglyphical representatives in the Egyptian papyri and inscriptions. The sub-division of the hieroglyphics into the Cyriologic, forming the first letters of the alphabet; and the symbolic, which are again subdivided into three classes, also strongly corroborates M. Champollion's theory, and furnishes an exact counterpart of his (1) *representative* hieroglyphics (*caractères purement figuratifs*) and of his (2) *symbolical*, or *tropical* ones; while the (3) *anaglyphs* are allegorical delineations, and bas-reliefs not strictly hieroglyphical, being usually accompanied by explanations in the latter characters (p. 301). The testimony of Clemens, therefore, who, as a Pagan, had been instructed "in all the wisdom of Egypt," not only confirms the theory delivered in the *Précis*, but explains what the Ancients meant by the alphabetical characters of the Egyptians.

M. Champollion, after examining what the Greek writers have said on this subject, (§. ix. 327—334), proceeds to point out (§. x. 334—350) the peculiar use of these different kinds of hieroglyphics. They are intermingled, he observes, in almost every possible way: the same word exhibiting in the same page either a combination of all three, or an example of each taken separately: thus we have (1) the jar and the goat; (2) jar, bird and goat; jar, bird, and goat-headed image, or the same image alone, as the expression for Nûb (Chnuphis). Memphis is represented by a Temple placed beside the letters, P, T, H, signifying "the sanctuary of Phthah," 'Hephæstopolis,' as it might be supposed the Greeks would have called it; for most of the similar names given by them to Egyptian cities, seem to be translations of the sacred names of those places, the common ones, which were quite different, having been preserved by the Arabs:—hence Shmin was called Panopolis; Shmûn, Hermopolis; On, Heliopolis; Osyût, Lycopolis, &c. The grammatical forms, terminations, affixes, prefixes, &c., are always expressed by phonetic hieroglyphics; and generally by the same characters. Ordinary proper names are distinguished by a generic representative character, subjoined; thus O S R T S N, followed by the figure of a man, (Pl. x. p. 197), signifies "the man Osortasen." S T E placed before the figure of a woman, signifies, "the woman Sate or Sati," (Satis.) A leg, cap, ring and lituus, before the hieroglyphic of "a God," signify "the God Bennô;" a feather, cap, fasces and bird before the same figure, signify "the God Anebô (Anubis)." The hieroglyphic characters, also, are never united, except through the whim or haste of the writer. (p. 347.)

It has been already remarked that in the papyri, and occasionally on stones and mummy-cases, another kind of writing is found, apparently quite distinct from the hieroglyphics. This, as was long since observed, must be the Epistolographic or *demotic*, and Dr. Young, by a careful examination of the Rosetta Inscription, had the merit of ascertaining, what no one ever suspected before, that it is merely a degradation of the hieroglyphics, notwithstanding their apparent dissimilarity. M. Champollion, treading in his steps, and enjoying the very great advantage of having nothing to distract his attention, advanced still further, and discovered that the *hieratic* is much more nearly allied to the demotic than the linear hieroglyphic, supposed by Dr. Young to be the character used by the sacred scribes, (*ἱερογραμματεῖς*). In one section of the Précis (ch. ix. § 11. p. 350—366) therefore, the special purposes for which these two characters were used, and the peculiarities which distinguish them, are more fully investigated. The hieroglyphics, in their perfect form, were too cumbersome and difficult of delineation for general use: the (1) *outline*, consequently, or slight sketch, was substituted as soon as writings of any length became requisite. These outlines are exact counterparts of their prototypes, differing merely in finish. But the desire of greater rapidity in execution, soon produced a further and more considerable modification of the original forms, and gave rise to the (2) *hieratic* or sacerdotal character, in which the sacred hymns were written. Some of the figures used in this character are entirely arbitrary, and the rest are such imperfect sketches of their prototypes as to be recognized with difficulty. It was therefore necessary in this mode of writing, to guard against the introduction of new or unusual forms, and accordingly, it is found that the number of phonetic characters used in it, is much greater than that of the symbolic or representative ones. Abbreviated and rapid as this hand appears, when compared even with the linear hieroglyphics, it was still too complicated to be fit for the common business of life. A further reduction, was therefore again made, more simple in form and more rapid in execution; and this was called, from its peculiar use and design, the *demotic*, or popular hand. In it the most common of the sacred characters were adopted; almost all phonetic, with few duplicates; so that of all the modes of writing used in Egypt, it is the simplest and most expeditious, and approximates most nearly to an alphabetical character. This explains at once why it was the character first taught by the Egyptians, and shows that Clemens has mentioned their different kinds of writing in the order in which they were learnt, not according to priority of invention.

If any part of the Egyptian paintings and sculptures was really mysterious and unintelligible to all except the initiated, it must have been the *Anaglyphs* or allegorical bas-reliefs, many of which were designed to preserve the knowledge of their theology and the history of their gods. Yet even these representations, though more intricate and complicated, were formed on the same principle, and had much that was common to other hieroglyphical delineations. These fantastic assemblages of incongruous—(for such the anaglyphs commonly are)—and arbitrary symbols, are by good luck precisely those of which illustrations may be drawn from the writings of the ancients. It is in such inexplicable bas-reliefs that most of the hieroglyphics explained by Horapollon, are found; and the interpretation of such mysterious figures was evidently his principal object. The ordinary forms and obvious symbols were known to every one; to explain them, would have been lost labour: but the rare and unintelligible combinations could be understood only by a few: they consequently were the only subjects upon which an Egyptian would think it worth his while to comment. It is manifest also that such a dictionary of hard words in hieroglyphics, would be of no use to a beginner, without a grammar and vocabulary; and the want of observing this plain truth has been the occasion of all the contempt and abuse cast upon Horapollon, and of the small advantage derived by the moderns from his labours.

M. Champollion concludes his work by a very able and interesting recapitulation (ch. x. p. 366—400) of all the most important topics discussed in it; beginning by a review of the attempts of his predecessors, and ending by a succinct, but luminous statement of the result of his own more successful researches. To Dr. Young he readily gives credit for having first determined the real meaning of a certain number of hieroglyphics, and for having “recognized the close connexion which exists between the running-hand of the papyri and the hieroglyphic writing:” but when he adds (p. 377), “Mais ce savant laborieux confondit en une seule deux écritures essentiellement différentes, l'*hiératique* et la *démotique*; il ne démêla point le principe phonétique qui est en quelque sorte l'ame des trois sortes d'écritures Égyptiennes, quoique ce même savant eût essayé d'analyser phonétiquement les deux noms propres hiéroglyphiques Ptolémée et Bérénice;” a lurking inclination to undervalue the aid by which he was enabled to do so much, seems unintentionally to betray itself. He forgets to mention that, in 1815, Dr. Young distinctly declared his conviction that (1) the enchorial characters were bastard hieroglyphics; that (2) many objects were represented by their actual delineations, that (3) many were used in a

figurative sense only; while others were arbitrary symbols; that (4) the numbers were indicated by a sort of cypher; that (5) proper names were enclosed in an oval ring or border, and that (6) the name of Ptolemy only existed in the hieroglyphics on the Rosetta pillar. (Young's *Discov. in Hierogl. Lit.* 334.) The connection also between the hieroglyphic and alphabetic characters is pointed out, if we mistake not, in the Supplement to the *Encycl. Brit.* (iv. 54) published in 1819, and certainly in the Appendix to Belzoni's *Travels* (503), printed in the very year in which M. Champollion's first *Mémoire* was read to the Royal Academy of Belles Lettres. Is it, moreover, quite certain, that these demotic and hieratic characters are really different? The specimens hitherto produced do not, we confess, convey to the mind that entire conviction which is requisite to justify such an exulting tone as M. Champollion seems in some places to assume. In this, and in some other points of a more general interest, a cloud of doubt and uncertainty still hangs over his speculations: especially with regard to the chronological data derived from the names and titles of the Pharaohs, as read by the aid of his system.

This subject, occasionally introduced in the body of the *Précis*, but more fully developed in the *Letters to the Duke de Blacas*, in the appendixes to which the chronological questions are ably discussed by M. Champollion-Figeac, is connected with such weighty inquiries, that it would be impossible to do it justice within the limits to which this paper must be restricted. The sequel to those letters, however, will afford a future opportunity of examining these questions; and it will be sufficient for the present to add a brief statement of M. Champollion's observations; and of the inferences which, according to his brother's calculations, arise from them.

“La grande question de l'antiquité plus ou moins reculée des monumens de l'Égypte, soit temples, soit palais, tombeaux obélisques ou colosses, a été irrévocablement décidée par la découverte de l'alphabet des hiéroglyphes, phonétiques,” says M. Champollion le Jeune in (p. 386), in terms which may, perhaps, be thought rather too magnificent: and it will also be remembered that “the first discovery of the name of Cleopatra was made by Mr. W. J. Bankes, in 1818.” (*Salt's Phonetic System of the Hierog.* p. 7.) This name which, “in a manner, furnished a key to all the rest,” was decyphered not from any vague conjectures as to the meaning of the hieroglyphics by which it is expressed, but by a regular chain of inferences, which would have escaped the notice of any ordinary observer. The continual recurrence in Egyptian bas-reliefs, of the *same* figure or pair

of figures, presenting offerings to the gods, led Mr. Banks to suppose that these must be "*conventional* portraits* of the founders" of those monuments. This conjecture was strongly corroborated by his finding a female figure, habited as Isis, on the cover of the sarcophagus, in one of the few tombs at Thebes, where a "female figure is represented singly throughout." Following up the same analogy, and remarking that, as in the Greek inscription on the Propylæum at Diospolis Parva, the name of Cleopatra precedes that of Ptolemy, so the female figure in the bas-reliefs precedes the male, he concluded that Ptolemy and Cleopatra must be the persons represented; and on comparing the name over the man's head with the scroll from the Rosetta stone furnished by Dr. Young, they were found exactly to agree. The same correspondence appeared on examining the obelisk removed from Philæ, and it was thence concluded that the scroll over the woman's head must contain the name of Cleopatra; an inference completely justified by an examination of the hieroglyphics, in which every letter common to both was expressed by the same sign in each; and no doubt could any longer remain as to the Egyptian mode of expressing Greek names. This was noted by Mr. Banks in the margin of a plate of that obelisk presented to the Institute. To that plate, he observes, M. Champollion refers his own discovery of this name; but the accompanying scroll on that obelisk contains the titles, and not the name of Cleopatra. M. Champollion, therefore, appears not to be entirely clear, in this respect, from a charge of disingenuousness: a circumstance the more to be lamented, as his skilful use of the hints afforded him, shows how little he stood in need of such an auxiliary.

But to return to the important results which he ascribes to his researches: "It has by these means," he says, (p. 387) "been ascertained that the following edifices are monuments of the wealth and piety of the Pharaohs, the native kings of Egypt:—the ruins at Sán (Tanis); the obelisk at Matariyyeh (Heliopolis); the Palace at El-ârabah (Abydos); a small temple at Denderah (Tentyris); various ruins at Carnac, El-ocsor, Med-âmùd, and

* These bas-reliefs therefore, in Mr. Banks's opinion, were themselves symbolical; and to the very same conclusion had M. Champollion been led by his observations: "Les temples, comme leur nom égyptien l'indique, n' étaient si l'on peut, s'exprimer ainsi, que de grandes et magnifiques caractères représentatifs des demeures célestes: les statues, les images des rois et des simples particuliers, les bas-reliefs et les peintures qui retraçaient au propre les scènes de la vie publique et privée, rentraient pour ainsi dire dans la classe des caractères figuratifs; et les images des dieux, les emblèmes des idées abstraites, les ornemens et les peintures allégoriques, enfin la nombreuse série des analoglyphes, se rattachaient d'une manière directe au principe symbolique d l'écriture proprement dite."—*Précis*, § 130, p. 365.

Cúrnah; the Memnonîum, and the palace called the Tomb of Osymandyas (on the site of Thebes); the Tombs at Bîbán-el-molúk; the Temples of Elephantine, and a very small part of those in Philæ. Structures erected by the same monarchs are found also in Nubia, at Calábisheh (Talmis); Ghirshel (Tzitzis); Mohharracah (Hierosycaminon); Wádî's-sebûâ; Amadah; Derr; Ibsambul (Phthur?); and Ssoleb. Those which were built under the Greek and Roman princes are the Temple at Bahbeît (Isidis Oppidum); the Casr Kerun (near Assinoë); the Portico at Caw el Kebîr (Antæopolis); the great temple and typhonium at Denderah (Tentyris); the portico at Isnâ (Letopolis); the temple to the north of it; the temple and typhonium at Edfû (Apollonopolis); the temples at Kûm Ombò (Ombos); the largest edifices in Philæ; and the temples at Calábisheh, Dendûr and Dackeh in Nubia.

This alone is, certainly, a very important result, as it throws an unexpected light on the history not only of the arts and sciences, but also upon the civil and religious institutions of Egypt. Much more important however, if ultimately confirmed, are the data thus obtained for determining the chronology of the early Egyptian history.

That the names are correctly read and rightly interpreted, there can be no doubt. When we find in an Egyptian manuscript PTAMN used as a proper name, and learn that Petammon in Coptic signifies "the Ammonian," or "that which belongs to Ammon," we can have little doubt that this is the Egyptian word corresponding with Ammonius in Greek; but the supposition becomes a certainty on finding a mummy bearing the very same name, expressed in hieroglyphics, and explained in Greek by the words ΠΕΤΕΜΕΝΟΣ Ο ΚΑΙ ΑΜΜΩΝΙΟΣ. If, however, the names in the royal scrolls should not be found to agree with those mentioned by the ancient historians, we shall be compelled to pause, and wait for further evidence, before we give our assent to conclusions which, however plausible, cannot be admitted, if they rest on untenable premises.

The names of the Pharaohs ascertained by M. Champollion are these: 1. On the plinth of two sphinxes of basalt in the Royal Museum at Paris there are these inscriptions: i. The king of an obedient people, (approved by Cneph,) son of the Sun HAKR. ii. The king of an obedient people, (beloved by the Gods,) son of the Sun (NAI PHRVIS)*. Achoris, according to Manetho (xxixth dynasty,) (Acoris in Diodorus Siculus, xv. 2.) was son and successor of Nephereus, who reigned in Egypt B. C. 395. The agreement of these names with those on the

* See in Salt's Pl. iv. 17, 18. the same name from Ilithyas-polis.

sphinxes, (themselves symbols of kings,) both brought, no doubt, from the same temple, affords a strong presumption in favour of the supposition that they were the kings of whom these sphinxes are memorials (181—193). 2. The obelisk called Campensis, from the Campus Martius, in which it was erected, is ascribed by Pliny to one of the ancient Pharaohs: its scrolls express “the beneficent sun PSM TK.” Who can for a moment doubt that this is Psammetichus, one of the most powerful sovereigns of Egypt? The same name was found by Mr. Salt (before the publication of the *Précis*,) at Carnac and Ilithyas (Salt, Pl. iv. 30, 31.) 3. The name on the obelisk at Heliopolis (Matariyyeh, not far from Caïro,) is OSRTSN; and a monumental figure in the possession of M. Durand, has two inscriptions relative to a king bearing that name, in one of which he is termed “King OSRTSN, beloved by king Pjam, (Psammûs,) the beloved by Ammon.” On another monumental column, “OSRTSN, son of PTHF,” is found.* This, therefore, must be King Osortasen, son of Phthahoph, or Phthahophtep, (tasted by Phthah.) Now, if we consult Manetho’s lists, we find that Petubas, or Petubastes, and his son Osorthos, or Osorthon, were the first and second kings of the 23d dynasty. (196—203.) Another column, brought from Egypt by M. Thédenat du Vent, has a figure subscribed “AMNM (Pjam) she t(she) OSRTSN,” i. e. “beloved by Ammon, Psammûs, the son of Osorthos;” but according to the authority cited above, Psammus was son and successor of Osorthos, and last of the 23d or Tanitic dynasty. 4. One of the colonnades which adorn the first court of the great palace at Thebes bears a royal scroll, containing these words, “Ammon-me SHSHNK,” i. e. “beloved by Ammon Sheshonk.” Have we not here the Sesonchis of Manetho, (first king of the 22d dynasty,) and the Shishac of Scripture, (1 Kings, xiv. 25.) who invaded Judea B. C. 971? His successor, according to Manetho, was Osorchon; and another scroll near this, contains the words “Beloved by Ammon, OSRKEN,” evidently the Osorkhon of the historian, and perhaps, as M. Champollion thinks, the Zerah who was defeated by Asa (2 Chron. xiv. 9.) B. C. 941. A papyrus, brought from Egypt by Denon, commemorates “the Purified by Ammon Re (Aruëris) Sovereign of the Gods, Osorkon, son of Sheshonk, life-giving king, tried by Anebô (Anubis).” Another part of the same papyrus shows that the father of Sesonchis

* On one of these columns his mother is named Ran, and on another she is also represented; but the inscription on the latter, as engraved by M. Champollion (Pl. x. 7.), is only “Mout neb-eï nanes-f” (his gracious mother, lady of the house), her name *Ran* not being added, as he says it is (199). This is not the only place in which his plates do not correspond exactly with his text.

was also named Osorchon. The oval border round the name of the grandfather is remarkable, inasmuch as he never sat upon the throne, nor is he here termed *King*, though honoured with other royal titles. A sphinx, preserved in the British Museum, is also commemorative of this celebrated prince. 5. The name which occurs most frequently on the finest monuments of Egyptian art is Ramses, which immediately recalls the names of Rhamses, Ramesses, or Ramestes, and Raâmses, (Exod. i. 11.) occurring in Hebrew, Greek, and Roman writers; and when we find this name with all its adjuncts, distinguishing some of the finest remains of antiquity from the extremity of Nubia to the shores of the Mediterranean, we are immediately led to ask whether this must not have been the title of Sesostris? The Flaminian obelisk at Rome, its copy the Salustian, the Mahutean, and Medicæan, in the same place; those at El-Ocsor, the ancient Thebes, and a bilingual inscription at Nahr-el-kelb, in Syria, all bear this legend: the power and dominions of this prince must therefore have been of no ordinary magnitude; and such was in truth that of the Rhamses, whom the priests at Thebes described to Germanicus as the greatest conqueror who ever lived (Tacit. Annal. ii. p. 78. ed. Elzevir. 1649.) But none of the ancient historians give this name to Sesostris. He is however called Sethos by Manetho, who tells us (Joseph. contra Apion. i. p. 1053.) that he was also called *Rhamesses*, from his grandfather Rhampses," and thus affords a clue by which all doubt is removed; and as Sethos, Sesos-tris, and Sesoos-is, are virtually the same name, and confessedly belong to the same person, so was the Rhamses of Tacitus, and the REMSS of these hieroglyphic inscriptions, no other than that mighty conqueror. His grandfather is called Rhameses Meïammûn by Manetho (15th king of the 18th dynasty), and that name appears on the great palace of Medînet-âbû and some other buildings in the ruins of Thebes: but the one is always named Ramses Ammon-meï, and has distinctive titles different from those of the other. This is alone sufficient to identify them; for as the Ptolemies were distinguished by their surnames, Philadelphus, Epiphanes, Soter, &c.; so were the ancient Egyptian kings by their peculiar titles, as is manifest from the double scrolls by which their names are usually expressed. From the tomb of Ramses Meï-ammûn, in the Bîbân-el-mulûk, Mr. Belzoni brought the cover of his sarcophagus of red granite, ornamented with a recumbent figure of the deceased king in the character of Osiris. It is now preserved in the Fitz-William Museum, at Cambridge, to which it was presented by that justly regretted traveller. 6. Amenophis II. (8th king of the 18th dynasty,) was "supposed to be Memnon," says

Manetho; and accordingly, on the throne of the celebrated vocal statue, which its many Greek inscriptions tell us is the Memnon of the ancients, there is a royal legend stating that this "Child of the Sun, *Amenoph*, was Lord by the aid of Rê and Satis (Juno)," i. e. that this sovereign was named Amenoph, just as one of the metrical inscriptions celebrates him as "Memnon, also called *Phamenoph*." The latter is the same name with the article (phi) prefixed, and it is an abridgment of Amenephthep, converted by the Greeks into Amenephthes. (233—240.) These examples taken from the *Précis* will show how happily various authorities conspire to show that the names of the Pharaohs have been correctly read, and that their appropriate titles, like those of the Chinese emperors, serve to distinguish such as bore the same names.

What was successfully begun in the *Précis*, has been ably continued in the two letters to the Duc de Blacas. In the first, sepulchral monuments, scarabæi, and other memorials of Manetho's 18th dynasty, are examined: and in the second, those relating to the 16th, 17th, 19th, 20th, and 21st. For the interesting details respecting these monuments, given by M. Champollion, the reader must be referred to the letters themselves. A very brief review of the chronological data afforded by them, is all that can be added here. It should also be mentioned that the greater number of them belong to the splendid collection formed by M. Drovetti, formerly French Consul in Egypt, and lately purchased by the King of Sardinia for the Royal Museum at Turin.

There are two elements which afford certain data for one of the epochs in early Egyptian history: 1. The Sothiac period, or Cynic cycle, of 1460 years consisting of 365 $\frac{1}{4}$ days, one revolution of which terminated in A.D. 138: and 2. The era of Menophres, mentioned in an unpublished commentary by Theon on Ptolemy's *Almagest*. The latter is preferred by M. Champollion Figeac in the "Notice Chronologique" appended to his brother's letters, as more convenient for the present purpose: but the two eras prove to be one and the same: and as it is highly probable that the latter was named from Menophres, on account of its having commenced in his reign: we may conclude that he sat upon the throne of Egypt B.C. 1322. Ammenephthes, or Amenophis, the 3d king of Manetho's 19th dynasty, appears to M. Champollion to be the Menophres of Theon. But the same historian (Georgii Syncelli Chronog.) fixes the invasion of Egypt by the shepherds in the 6th year of Concharis, and in the 700th of the preceding period of the Cynic cycle. By putting these dates together, therefore, we may ascertain in what year of the reign of Amenophis the period named from him began.

Years of the Cycle elapsed	700
Reign of Shepherd Kings	260
Duration of the 18th Dynasty	348
Reign of Sesostris, first king of the 19th Dynasty	55
Reign of Ramses II. second ditto . . .	66
	<hr/>
	1429
Beginning of reign of Amenophis . . .	31
	<hr/>
	1460

It is plain, therefore, that the period of the Cynic cycle, which Theon calls the cycle of Menophres, began in the 32d year of Amenoph, whose name approaches nearly to that given in the MSS.* This is the basis of M. Champollion Figeac's calculations; and after carefully discussing the discordances with respect to some reigns found in the different extracts from Manetho, and rejecting the false interpretations put upon that historian's words by Josephus (1st letter, 104.), he constructs the following Table, which will appear of no trifling interest to those who pay attention to chronological enquiries.

XVIth DYNASTY.

Name.	B. C.
Osymandyas	2272
Two kings not named	2222
Amesses, or Amosis	2113
Timäus, or Concharis	2088
Invasion of the Hycsos, or Shepherd kings . . .	2082

XVIIth DYNASTY.

Pharaohs.	Shepherd Kings.	
1 (1st Scroll in the Geneal. Table at Abydos) }	Salatis	2082
2. Ammeneme Pi	Bæon	2063
3. (3d Scroll)	Apachnis	2019
4. (4th —)	Apochis, or Apophis . . .	1983
5. (5th —)	Janias	1922
6. (6th —) Amosis or Misphrag-Muthosis }	Assis, or Asseth	1872
	expelled by Amosis.	

XVIIIth DYNASTY.

Greek Names,	Egyptian Names.	
Amosis, or Thoutmosis	(Amenoftep)	1822
Chebron	(Thoutmes I.)	1791
Amenophis I.	(Amen-meï)	1778
Amenses	(Amensè)	1757
Miphres, or Mæris	(Thoutmes II.)	1736

* If Ré (the Sun) be added, we have Amenophrè almost letter for letter, the name given by Theon.

Miphra-Thoutmosis	(Amenof I.)	1723
Thoutmosis	(Thoutmes III.)	1697
Amenophis II.	(Amenof II.)	1687
Horus	(Hôr)	1657
Acencherses	(Tmauhmot)	1618
Rathotis, or Athoris	(Ramses I.)	1606
Achencheres I.	(Osireï)	1597
Achencheres II.	(Mandueï)	1585
Armais, or Armes	(Ramses II.)	1565
Ramesses	(Ramses III.)	1561
Ramesses Meiamûn	(Ramses IV.)	1559
Amenophis III. Ramesses	(Ramses V.)	1493

XIXth DYNASTY.

Sethos, or Sesostris	(Ramses VI.)	1473
Rampses, or Pheron	(Ramses VII.)	1418
Amenephthes, or Menophres	(Amenoftep IV.)	1352
Rameses	(Ramses VIII.)	1312
Ammenemes	(Ramses IX. Amenmé)	1291
Thuôris or Polybus	(Ramses X.)	1286

XXth DYNASTY.

Nechepsos	1279
with his two successors reigned 178 years	

XXIst DYNASTY.

Mendes, or Smendis	(Mandûftep)	1101
Psûsenes I.		1075
Nephelcheres		1029
Amenophthis		1025
Osochôr		1016
Psinaches		1010
Psûsenes II.	(Oosen)	1001

XXIIInd DYNASTY.

Sesonchosis, or Shishak	(Sheshonk)	971
-----------------------------------	--------------------	-----

With regard to these dynasties, we may add, that Arthoût, one of the kings of the 20th dynasty, is the Pharaoh whose sarcophagus is preserved in the British Museum, and supposed to be the tomb of Alexander; and that the Egyptian names have been determined by "the Genealogical Table" found by Mr. Bankes, while making excavations "for the purpose of obtaining an accurate ground plan of the extensive ruins at Abydos." It is on the wall of a smaller building than the Memnonium, from which the former is quite distinct, and is a Table containing three horizontal and parallel rows of royal scrolls or legends: the two upper ones (of which the uppermost is imperfect) contain only the distinctive titles; the lowest both the title and proper name of Sesostris,

(Ramses Ammon-mei,) in whose reign this sculpture was doubtless made. M. Champollion was indebted for his copy of this most invaluable monument to M. Cailliaud, and does not seem to have heard of Mr. Bankes's, which was engraved soon after his return to England, in 1819. The thirteen scrolls immediately preceding that of Sesostris, proved, by comparison with other monuments, to be those of his immediate predecessors (*Précis*, 245-6. *Prem. Lettre*. 15.); and it was, therefore, in all probability, when perfect, a complete genealogy of the early Egyptian kings. As this is M. Champollion's main stay in the chronological parts of his work, it is right to observe that in the upper row, his copy differs from that given by Mr. Bankes, the third scroll from the end of that line in the latter being omitted in the former: as that, however, is finished with most care, it is probably the most correct, though in such a case subtraction is more likely to arise from haste than addition. If the error rest with Mr. Bankes, the speculations of M. Champollion will not need any modification; but if the error is in M. Cailliaud's copy, it would materially affect his determination of the kings belonging to the preceding dynasties. Of the 16th, however, he has noted only one prince, and *his* title does not appear on the Table of Abydos. Another remark, which M. Champollion's chronology suggests, arises from the date assigned to the reign of Sesostris. Mæris, the immediate predecessor of that prince, died, according to Herodotus (ii. 13.), not quite 900 years before he visited Memphis, i. e. before 460 B. C. Sesostris therefore ascended the throne a few years later than 1360 B. C., about 120 years after the period assigned above. But the testimony of Herodotus, who lived so long before Manetho, ought surely to be well weighed, before it is rejected.

ART. XI.—*A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of London, at the Visitation in July, 1826.* By William, Lord Bishop of London. 4to. 2s. Rivingtons. 1826.

EPISCOPAL charges are, unquestionably, very valuable documents; such of them, at least, as bear any considerable resemblance to the one now before us. It is most heartily to be wished, not only that every clergyman in the diocese of London, but that every intelligent layman, would provide himself with a copy of this address, as it touches on many topics of high interest and importance, and exemplifies most of the excellencies appropriate to compositions of this nature. Its style is chaste, perspicuous and dignified; its temper singularly moderate, though without the

slightest approach towards the sacrifice of any momentous principle. It speaks, indeed, as it ought, *with authority*; softened, however, by that paternal tone which becomes a spiritual father of the Christian family. For the benefit of those of our readers who may be without an opportunity of perusing it, we subjoin a few extracts, which cannot but be acceptable to all, who have a truly filial attachment to the church.

The Bishop, having first adverted to "some points of ecclesiastical regulation, relating to the parochial clergy," proceeds to notice the revival of the controversy with the Romish Church. We gladly insert the whole of his remarks on that subject, because they exhibit the "meekness of wisdom" in its perfection.

"In respect to her external relations, the affairs of the Church have proceeded not unsatisfactorily since our last meeting. Among the most remarkable events which have occurred during that period, is the revival of controversy respecting the pretensions and doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church, which, in this country at least, had ceased for many years to excite any degree of attention. The weakness of the grounds on which that Church rests her claims to spiritual sovereignty over Christendom, the authority which she assigns to tradition as a rule of faith, and the unscriptural character of many of those doctrines which she imposes on the belief of Christians, had been so clearly demonstrated by the early Reformers, and again by our divines after the Restoration, as to satisfy the nation at large of the necessity of separating from a communion, which required the sacrifice of liberty and truth by the acknowledgment of an usurped power, and the profession of a corrupt faith. The arguments on both sides having been sifted again and again, and placed in every different view, the discussions were gradually discontinued, or, if renewed from time to time by the zeal of divines, excited little interest. A long and active hostility subsided into a virtual truce: the Protestant laid down his arms in the confidence of victory, and the Roman Catholic was unwilling to renew an attack, from which, though firm in his persuasion, he had been taught by experience to expect no beneficial result. In consequence of this mutual forbearance, the reasons of our separation from Rome, and the real principles of the Roman Catholic Church, which once had been generally known, were no longer familiar to the public; and many persons were led to imagine, that a change had been insensibly wrought in her system, that she had modified her objectionable tenets, had become more tolerant to Christians of other persuasions, and was disposed, if not formally to disavow her exclusive pretensions, yet to abstain from pressing them. It is true, that the principles which were taught in her schools of divinity, as well as the public documents put forth by her highest authorities, contradicted this charitable supposition; but few persons would be at the trouble of examining lectures in theology, and it was said, with some show of probability, that official papers must speak the language of form, which is prescribed by ancient usage, and is not always to be understood in its strict sense. The silence has however been broken; and the question at issue between the Reformers

and the Roman Catholic Church has been warmly debated on religious grounds, and, on both sides, with no mean ability. Of the issue of such a controversy, even had the cause of truth been defended with less power of reason and eloquence than was displayed on this occasion, there could be little doubt. In the estimation at least of every Protestant, our adversaries have equally failed in the proof of their charges against our National Church, and in the defence of their own. It is not my intention to enter into the general question, any branch of which is too large for the present occasion, and which has been ably and amply discussed in publications which are in the hands of every one. The point to which I would draw your attention, is the light which has been thrown, in the result of the controversy, on the character of the Romish Church; the utter disapproval of any alteration, or even the possibility of alteration, in her principles, claims, or doctrines. Whatever difference of opinion, under the connivance, if not the allowance, of her rulers, may be tolerated, in some respects and in some countries, all her Divines of any authority agree in asserting, that she alone, with the successor of St. Peter at her head, the representative of Christ upon earth, is the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Church, out of whose bosom there is no salvation; that to her all Churches are subject, as their mother and mistress; the parent to whom they are indebted for their being; the sovereign from whom they derive their authority, and to whom their allegiance is due; that in virtue of the promises of Christ and the continual assistance of his Spirit, she is infallible, exempt from the possibility of error, in matters of faith, and authorized to enforce her decisions on the conscience of all Christians. The unity of faith, of worship, of government, all drawn to a point under the supremacy of the Pope, is essential to the constitution of her church, and admits of no impeachment. Her authority she cannot renounce in the slightest particular, because, emanating from Christ, as a trust to be exercised for the good of mankind, it is inherent and inalienable; nor can she subject her doctrines to revision, because infallibility precludes aberration from truth, and truth is incapable of variation. The system of doctrine which she is thus engaged to maintain, has been long since defined and established, by the Council of Trent, and the creed of Pius the IVth. which latter embodies the peculiar doctrines rejected by Protestants, and enjoins, under pain of damnation, their reception by every Christian, together with implicit belief of all that is held by the Romish Church, and the renunciation of all opposite errors. To this must be added, her utter rejection of any distinction of doctrines into *fundamental* or *not fundamental*: she regards not the importance of the doctrine: it is the slight to her authority which subjects the offender to anathema, for the obvious reason, that by impugning her judgment on the most insignificant point, he questions her pretence to infallibility. This is in effect the great strength of the Romish Church, the principle which cements the system of error, and prevents it from falling into ruin. It is this 'sacred inflexibility,' as it is termed by her advocates, 'her incompatibility with any error whatsoever,'—in other words, her determined adherence to the whole body of doctrines, whether true or false, which she has once made part of her creed,—which constitutes her principal security. Hence she disclaims all compromise

in questions relating to her hierarchy or articles of faith, and denies the privileges and even the name of a Church, to every Christian community, and the hope of salvation to all individuals who refuse subjection to her authority. I do not accuse her of uncharitableness on account of this exclusive spirit : the authority which she believes to have been conferred on her by Christ, it is her duty to exercise : the privileges received at His hands, she is not at liberty to relinquish : the faith delivered to her custody, she is bound to maintain in its integrity : and, if separation from her communion involves the guilt of apostacy and the forfeiture of the promises of salvation, she is under a sacred obligation to lift up her voice, and warn mankind of their danger. But, the more firmly she is persuaded of her divine right, and disposed to act in accordance with it, the more incumbent is it on those who deny her authority, and think they are able to prove that she not only is liable to error, but has grievously erred, in matters of faith, to be sure of the grounds on which they form their conclusions and assert their independence. Where such are the pretensions advanced, the truth or the falsehood of particular articles of faith becomes a secondary question. If Christ has appointed the Church of Rome the exclusive possessor of his promises, the sole depository of his authority, the infallible judge in controversies regarding the faith, it is useless to debate on other matters. If this point is decided in her favour, our only resource is to acknowledge our errors, to sue for reconciliation, and accept the system of doctrines, which is proved to be true by her sanction.

“ In these statements, it is far from my intention to excite angry feelings. My object has simply been, to explain, in exact consistency with truth, and without unnecessary harshness of language, the actual position which the Church of Rome has assumed in regard to the Churches which disclaim her authority, and the consequences which flow from her pretensions. Other Churches may differ from us in points of importance ; may reproach us with defects and corruptions, and think it right to abstain from our communion. The Romish Church asserts a title to privileges, which, if they really belong to her, cut us off from connection with Christ, and place us, as rebels, usurpers, and apostates, out of the pale of the Christian Church. Other Churches, if they fall into error, may be corrected by time and reason. The obnoxious tenets of many Christian sects have either been dropped from their confessions, or have silently sunk into oblivion. But the errors of Rome are imperishable ; they derive from her principles the character of immutability which belongs to divine truth, and are asserted with equal confidence.

“ When we are acquainted with the true state of the controversy, we may form our own conclusions, and these will undoubtedly lead us, as faithful sons of a Church, which neither in purity of doctrine, nor holiness of worship, nor the apostolical succession of its ministers, is inferior to any other Christian Church, with calmness and steadiness to resist an usurpation which would despoil us at once of our faith, our liberties, and our sacred character. And how is this to be done ?—Not surely by retaliating mis-statements, invectives, and calumnies, or crudely asserting an unqualified right of private judgment, but by reference to primitive antiquity : disproving the allegations of our opponents from the silence of

Scripture, of general tradition, of ancient writers, which in a case of this nature* is decisive; appealing to the proceedings of Emperors, the acts of Councils, the language of Fathers, of Bishops, and even of Popes, which contradict the pretensions of the Papacy; and tracing the growth of this ecclesiastical tyranny from its rise after the division of the empire, till it attained to its height towards the close of the eleventh century. The Holy Scriptures, and the genuine records of ancient usage and practice, will in like manner supply us with proof of the real authority, the legitimate privileges conferred on the Church, and derived immediately from Christ on all particular Churches, which are true members of his body. And if we enter on our charge with that sense of its dignity, and humble reliance on aid from above, which we cannot but feel, if we are assured of our mission from Christ, and the truth of his promises to the Church, we may hope for the satisfaction of confuting our adversaries of every description, not only by unanswerable arguments, but by the power of the spirit of God appearing in the fruits of our ministry.”—p. 8. 13.

We will not, ourselves, depart from the spirit in which this passage is conceived, by comparing it with the temper which, of late especially, has marked the language and the proceedings of our adversaries. It would be difficult to institute such a comparison without losing something of that composure which the Bishop so powerfully recommends by his own example. We will confine ourselves to the expression of a wish, that, whatever may be the fate of the great political question connected with this controversy, the bitterness of the discussions arising out of it may be assuaged by some infusion of that truly Christian mildness which pervades this charge.

After some brief and judicious observations on the opposition which the clergy must always have to encounter “from the attacks of dissent, infidelity and fanaticism,” we have the following impressive admonition, respecting the only weapons fit for that warfare. We give the passage, because, in a very few words, it

* “If it be objected, that these discourses are negative, and therefore of small force, I answer that therefore they are most proper to assert such a negative proposition; for how can we otherwise show a thing not to be, than by showing it to have no footing there, where it is supposed to stand? How can we more clearly argue a matter of right to want proof, than by declaring it not to be extant in the laws grounding such right, not taught by the masters who profess to instruct in such things, not testified in records concerning the exercise of it? Such arguments indeed in such cases are not merely negative, but rather privative; proving things not to be, because not affirmed there, where in reason they ought to be affirmed; standing therefore upon positive suppositions that Holy Scripture, that general tradition are not imperfect and lame toward their design; that ancient writers were competently intelligent, faithful, diligent; that all of them could not conspire in perpetual silence about things, of which they had often fair occasion and great reason to speak: in fine, such considerations, however they may be eluded by sophistical wits, will yet bear great sway, and often will amount near to the force of demonstration with men of honest prudence.’ These remarks are cited from Barrow, who has treated this part of the argument with his usual copiousness and power in his admirable treatise on the Pope’s Supremacy, a work which should be studied by every one who wishes to understand the subject thoroughly.”—See *Barrow’s Works*, v. 6. p. 202. Oxford, 1818.

recalls the ministers of Christianity to certain leading principles, which should never be absent from their thoughts ; and it does this in a style of calm solemnity much more likely to secure obedience, than a manner which savours of rebuke and accusation.

“ After all, the success of our ministry, the usefulness, I may say the existence, of the Establishment depends on our wisdom and diligence in performing the work of Evangelists towards that portion of the flock which is committed to our immediate care. Whilst the great body of the Clergy distributed through the kingdom, sustain, as they should do, in their several parishes, their appropriate character, as messengers and stewards of Christ, and by their personal conduct and attention to their ministerial and pastoral duties, deserve the love and respect of the people, the Church will never fall. It is therefore of the greatest importance that they should understand the nature of their obligations, and endeavour, both in their private and professional life, to fulfil them in their utmost extent. The eyes of the parishioners are constantly fixed on their Clergyman : however indulgent to themselves or their neighbours, they make no allowance for his failings ; they expect him, and not without reason, to set them a pattern of virtue and piety in his own person : they are quick in perceiving, and ready in censuring, any defect in his manner of performing the Church service, more especially if it proceeds from negligence : they are shocked if, on any occasion, he appears to be indifferent to the spiritual edification of his flock. In all these points, their feelings and judgment are correct and nice ; and the minister who fails of obtaining the personal respect, or fruit of his teaching, which might be expected from his character and ability, may generally trace the disappointment to some offence which has been taken at his failure in one of these respects. In truth, it is not enough that a Clergyman is chargeable with no vices, and acts with unexceptionable propriety in the ordinary concerns of life : nor will he obtain respect even by substantial virtues, unless he maintains the elevation and dignity of character which become a minister of Christ. The slightest departure from simplicity and gravity of conversation, whether it be affectation in dress or levity in behaviour, or inordinate fondness of amusements, is an indecency in his station ; and indiscretions, which may cast a shade of suspicion on his morals, will be altogether fatal to his usefulness. There may also be faults on the other side : severity and moroseness will alarm or offend, and make even piety unamiable ; and seriousness, though peculiarly suitable to the minister of the Gospel, may be carried to an excess, or shown in a manner, which will disgust persons of plain sense and sober piety.”
—pp. 15, 16.

In parishes, like many of those in London, whose inhabitants are reckoned by myriads, the occasional duties of the clergy are not only harassing to their spirits, and oppressive to their physical powers, but they are, by their perpetual recurrence, apt to endanger the devotional manner so necessary to give them their full effect. It is of course incumbent on a bishop to lift up his voice against a remissness which tends to sacrifice so much of the best influence which the Church can exercise over the public

mind. Let the minister who is most sorely burdened by occupations of this nature, attentively peruse the following words of our Diocesan; let him endeavour to recal them in the moment of impatience, weariness and exhaustion. We cannot doubt that the recollection of them would often rally his fainting spirits, and restore to the sacred formularies all that deep and solemn interest which they may have lost by incessant repetition.

“ Few things give greater offence, or create more estrangement from the Church, than a hasty and slovenly manner of performing the *occasional offices*. These seem to have been drawn up with an immediate view to effect on the minds of individuals, at a time when it is particularly desirable that they should receive good impressions. Thus in the *Office of Baptism*, the foundations of our faith, the terms of the Christian covenant, and the instruction to be given to children, are set forth so clearly and fully, that no one who listens with attention can be ignorant of his obligations to Christ, or his duty to his own family. The careless performance of the service defeats this good intention: the ceremony passes off as a matter of course, and is regarded as a mere formality. How beautifully, again, in the *Burial Service*, are the considerations of the frail tenure of life, the comfortable promises of immortality, and the certainty of a judgment to come, adapted to the state of the heart, when it is prepared by affliction to listen to the warnings, or to receive the consolations of religion! But the effect depends on the minister: if he is careless and cold, or shows signs of haste and impatience, the mourner who follows, in all the excitement of sorrow, the remains of a friend or relation to the grave, retires disappointed and grieved at an indifference so little in accordance with the awful ceremony, so offensive to his own feelings. This latter service, in particular, is often attended by those who are not in the habit of resorting to our places of public worship, and may sometimes afford the only occasion of awakening the conscience of the profane or immoral, or softening the prejudices of Dissenters. It is therefore the more to be lamented, that, through want of attention, it should ever produce a contrary effect. I will not conceal that I have occasionally heard complaints on these subjects; and though I am aware that in populous parishes the strength of the minister must be sometimes exhausted by the incessant recurrence of these duties, I do not think it too much to expect that he should use a little exertion, (recollection, perhaps I should say,) to overcome his lassitude. If he reflects for an instant on the nature of the service, he will perform it with due solemnity. I am persuaded that no serious man will regard these matters with indifference. The least things connected with the service of God are considerable, if in no other respect, as indications of disposition and feeling.”—pp. 17, 18.

The remaining topics adverted to in this charge are, first, the immense importance of Day Schools, or Sunday Schools for the instruction of the poor, on the national system; these are urgently recommended, as worthy of all the thoughts and exertion which a parochial minister can bestow on them, and as most likely to

crown his labours with an abundant reward. It is well known that the Bishop of London has been obstinately and bitterly assailed as the enemy of education. If there exist at this moment individuals ignorant or malicious enough to persevere in this brainless and heartless calumny, to the language of this Charge we would refer them, seconded as it is by the uniform and notorious tenor of his Lordship's conduct. They will there find an irresistible confutation of their slander. They will be compelled either to renounce their error, or virtually to confess that it is an error too precious to be given up!

"But then," his Lordship adds,

"while the principal attention of the Christian minister is confined to his immediate duties, he will be anxious to contribute in his proportion to the spiritual happiness of his fellow-creatures on a more extended scale. It is the nature of piety to delight in the diffusion of blessings; and Christian Churches have ever been careful to testify their zeal for the honour of God, and the good of mankind, by founding and supporting establishments for religious and charitable purposes. It is impossible to contemplate without much satisfaction the number and importance of such institutions, in close connection with our own Church, and principally maintained by the Clergy, and those of her lay members who are most decidedly attached to her principles."—p. 19.

These remarks naturally lead to the mention of several institutions, which have the first claim on the beneficent support of all who are sincerely attached to the Establishment; namely, the two sister Societies "for Promoting Christian Knowledge," and "for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts;" the "Society for the Conversion and Religious Instruction of Negro Slaves," established by Bishop Porteus; and the Institutions "for the Education and Maintenance of Orphans," and "the Relief of the Widows" of poor Clergymen. Our space forbids us to insert the arguments and statements by which his Lordship bespeaks the public patronage in behalf of these admirable designs. We do, however, most earnestly solicit the attention of the pious and the affluent to the earnest exhortations of the Bishop on this subject. There are many well disposed and excellent individuals who are fond of picturesque excursions into the wild and devious regions of charitable and religious enterprize. There are mixed up with the compassion of such persons certain elements, of which they are hardly conscious, but which by no means improve its quality. Their kindness is sometimes rendered volatile and unsteady by a capricious appetite for novelty and excitement; and thus it often happens that charitable designs are pursued by them in something of the same spirit, which keeps the children of this world perpetually flitting, and wheeling, and doubling through all the mazes of fashionable variety and dissipation. Strange as

it may appear, occupations connected with benevolence and piety may, at last, stand in the place of amusements to those whose sensibilities are fitful, and whose principles are imperfectly established. We repeat, that such persons are frequently unconscious of this unsettled habit of mind, which engages them in an endless course of experimental humanity, and drives them round the whole encyclopædia of religious charity. We therefore, once more entreat of them to consider whether their sympathies, and their resources, might not be more effectively applied within a more definite sphere. Certain charitable designs there are, whose value is unquestionable, and which present the amplest scope for the application of wealth, talent and activity. Of this nature are the institutions, of which the Bishop of London here stands forth the venerable and zealous advocate. Let us hope that he will not appeal in vain to the dutiful sons of the English Church.

We close our extracts from this admirable Charge with a portion of the concluding paragraph, which cannot fail to animate us with a sense of consolation and encouragement.

“ In the course of this Address, I have cursorily touched on a number of subjects, but I trust at sufficient length to excite the attention which their real importance deserves. It is surely essential to our reputation and usefulness, as the Clergy of a National Church, that in the discharge of our relative duties one towards another, we should act with a mutual regard to the laws of charity and of conscience; that we should join as one man in asserting our spiritual mission, and defending our pure faith, against the overbearing encroachments of usurpation and error; that we should hallow the name of our Lord in every point of our ministry, from the greatest down to the least; that we should co-operate with our Church in its designs for imparting the knowledge of salvation to all mankind; that we should be forward in every good work, more especially in relieving the indigent families of our deceased brethren. And, when I consider the spirit that prevails among the Clergy, their liberal submission to lawful authority; their ability in the defence of our Apostolical Church, and their attachment to the doctrine contained in its formularies; when I see them in the midst of their parishes, engaged in their pastoral labours, and compute the result of their exertions, in extending the means of education, and the facilities of public worship, I perceive great reason to rejoice. When, again, I behold our societies, intent on the maintenance of pure Christianity among the colonists, and the conversion of the heathen in our foreign settlements, encouraging the erection of Churches, the foundation of schools, and the endowment of colleges, on spots which, within our own recollection, were desolate wildernesses, or the habitations of barbarous tribes unacquainted with the name of Christ, and performing the work of evangelists to the ends of the earth; when I see the most enlightened men in the country applying their wealth and talents to the furtherance of these exertions, and witness the disposition of our Government to promote true Christian worship at home, and to afford to the remotest dependencies of the empire the bles-

sings of our holy religion in their fulness and purity, I feel a confidence rising within me, that, under the protection of its Supreme Head, and the guidance of his Holy Spirit, our Church will ultimately triumph over all the attacks of superstition, enthusiasm, or infidelity, however abetted by worldly ambition, or impelled by fanatical zeal, will gradually throw off the dross which is generated by human corruption in her own bosom, and shine as the luminary of the Christian world till the second coming of her founder.—pp. 24, 25.

ART. XII.—*Observations on Clerical Funds; a Letter addressed to the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Chester.* By the Rev. William Hale Hale, M.A. his Lordship's Domestic Chaplain, and Preacher at the Charter House. 8vo. pp. 24. 1s. 6d. London. Mawman. 1826.

MR. HALE commences with observing, that the Clerical Funds now in existence are applied to the relief of disabled clergymen, or of poor clergymen, or of the widows or orphans of clergymen; and he proposes a plan by which widows may be provided for from a new source. He thinks it impracticable to enforce a compulsory contribution from the clergy for this purpose, and suggests in lieu thereof, the formation of Diocesan Societies, for securing Annuities to the Widows of Clergymen. We subjoin an outline of the scheme.

All the clergy of a diocese are eligible for admission; but such as do not join the society within six months after its establishment, or within six months after their admission into the diocese, shall be excluded, except on the condition of paying up such arrears, together with interest, and compound interest, as would be due on the supposition of their having joined the society at the aforesaid time. The society is divided into seven classes, and the annual subscriptions and marriage fines payable by members, are as follows.

Annuity to Widow.	Class.	Bachelor's Subscription Annually.			Fine on Marriage.			Married Member's Ann. Sub.		
		<i>l.</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>	<i>l.</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>	<i>l.</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
100 <i>l.</i>	I.	5	5	0	52	10	0	14	0	0
75 <i>l.</i>	II.	3	18	9	39	7	6	10	10	0
50 <i>l.</i>	III.	2	12	6	26	5	0	7	0	0
40 <i>l.</i>	IV.	2	2	0	21	0	0	5	12	0
25 <i>l.</i>	V.	1	6	3	13	2	6	3	10	0
20 <i>l.</i>	VI.	1	1	0	10	10	0	2	16	0
10 <i>l.</i>	VII.	0	10	6	5	5	0	1	8	0

If the age of the husband exceed that of the wife by more than five years, there is an additional fine for every year above that number. "No widow shall be entitled of right to an annuity, whose husband has not been a married member five years, and made six annual payments;" without which provision it would be necessary to adopt a scale of annual payments, nearly one half greater. Then follow provisos for bachelors marrying to increase the annuity, for married members to increase the annuity, and for a reduction of the marriage fine after having subscribed ten, and for its remission after having subscribed during twenty, years as a bachelor. Widowers are to subscribe as bachelors, but to pay a fresh fine upon a second marriage. Widows marrying again, are to lose their annuity during the continuance of such marriage; and *members marrying annuitants* are to pay the marriage fine, but subscribe as bachelors. Such is Mr. Hale's plan, and we extract the observations which accompany it.

"As to the correctness of the scale of payments, here proposed by way of example, it will be deemed, I should hope, sufficient to state, that the plan now laid before your lordship has been examined and approved by Wm. Morgan, Esq. the able and intelligent Actuary of the Equitable Insurance Office, and that the payments are in proportion nearly the same as those adopted under his express direction, by a Society established in 1820, for the benefit of Widows of Officers in the Medical Department of the Army, and which, in the formation of its plan, has availed itself of the experience of similar institutions, of many years' standing, in the Royal Artillery and Engineers. The talent and experience which have been called into action in these establishments, preclude all doubt as to their capability of meeting their engagements to bodies of persons, whose lives are exposed to dangers and casualties far more destructive than any that can possibly occur to the clergy.

"How far, my lord, the plan here proposed, of which the most striking and also the most valuable feature is, the securing the co-operation of persons* not yet married, may meet the wishes of the Clergy, can only, before experiment made, be judged of by what has happened in similar cases. but we may fairly expect that, in the adoption of the proposed plan by the Clergy of the Church of England, feelings will be displayed as honourable and as remarkable as those which have distinguished the Clergy of Scotland, and the married and unmarried officers in those departments of the army which have been mentioned. In the year 1743, when the Widows' Fund was established in Scotland, which prospectively made it compulsory upon the beneficed Clergy of Scotland to subscribe to the Fund, only 146 ministers out of 997 declined to enrol themselves amongst its members. The pensions originally insured to the

* Mr. Morgan has stated that, in order to secure the stability of the fund, one-fourth of the members should be unmarried. How far this proportion will suit the condition of the clergy, has not yet been ascertained. Should it be found to vary considerably, a different scale of payment must be adopted.

widows, varied, at the option of the minister subscribing, from 10*l.* to 15*l.*, 20*l.*, and 25*l.*; and the fact which I am now about to state, I bring forward, to show with what readiness men avail themselves of the advantages offered by these funds, to the utmost of their means. By the Report made to the general assembly, in 1824, it appeared, that of 332 Annuitants, only 6 were widows whose husbands had subscribed for the lowest pension in the scale, 10*l.*; and only 54 for the second pension, 15*l.*; whilst 134 persons had subscribed for 20*l.* pension, and 137 for the highest pension, 25*l.* These are facts drawn from the Report of a Fund, to which the contribution is compulsory, the degree of it alone being optional. An equally encouraging result is shown in the Report of the Voluntary Association for securing Pensions to the Widows of Officers in the Medical Department of the Army. The whole number of subscribers in March last, was 629; of these, 75 were married members, subscribing to receive 20*l.* pension for their widows; whilst those who subscribed for the larger sum, 40*l.*, amounted to 184. Of members still unmarried, who had enrolled themselves in the class to receive the lowest pension, the number was 154, whilst that of the highest class was 216.

“The Royal Artillery Marriage Society is an association perfectly voluntary amongst the officers of that corps; yet the number of subscribers amounted, in January 1826, to 605; and of these, 273 only were married, the remaining 332 being either bachelors or widowers.”
—pp. 19—21.

With sentiments of the highest respect for the Prelate under whose sanction this measure is brought forward, and with sincere gratitude to the ingenious and excellent person, who has arranged and developed its details, we are compelled to express grave doubts respecting the possibility of carrying it into effect. Upon the great want of some better provision for the widows of clergymen, two opinions cannot exist; and we do not presume to say that we are prepared with a better, or even with as good a scheme as Mr. Hale's. But his plan appears to us to be open to the following objections:—

As no widow is entitled to an annuity unless her husband has made six annual payments, and been a married member five years; a clergyman must either insure his life for those five years, or run the risk of leaving his widow destitute in spite of his subscription to the Diocesan Society. And this risk must be considerable; for Mr. Morgan computes that it could not be guarded against “without adopting a scale of annual payments, nearly one half greater.” Now if a clergyman must first subscribe as a bachelor, secondly pay a marriage fine, and thirdly, insure his life for the first five or six years of his marriage, ought he to prefer Mr. Hale's system, to a common life-insurance, which may purchase an annuity for his widow, or

provide for the education of his children, as he may please to direct?

“ But the most striking and most valuable feature of the plan is, securing the co-operation of persons not yet married.” And in the Military Societies this feature undoubtedly produces a great effect; because, in both of the cases quoted by Mr. Hale, considerably more than half the subscribers are bachelors, and the proportion is not likely to vary. But the proportion of unmarried clergymen has not yet been ascertained; if it is less than a fourth, a higher scale of payment must be adopted, and we suspect that even an eighth would be above the truth.

We suspect also that Mr. Hale will not find the same facility in procuring subscriptions as has been experienced in the excellent and well conducted societies to which he refers. The medical officers of the army, and the officers of the artillery are small and compact bodies; they are in constant communication with the head quarters of their respective corps; their pay, we presume, is usually remitted through agents; and the subscriptions paid to the fund are merely deductions from their allowances. There is also throughout the service an universal disposition to befriend the *poor married* officer. His uncomfortable circumstances are placed in a strong light before the eyes of kind-hearted bachelors, who, while they continue bachelors, have generally money to spare, and will gladly contribute to make provision for the widow of a messmate, whom they know to be incapable of doing so himself. The unmarried clergy are neither so well acquainted with the situation of a married brother, nor so able to assist him when in distress. In fact, a large proportion of the few who continue unmarried are either under the influence of ruthless poverty, or are scraping up a purse to pay their *marriage fines*.

We have ventured to throw out these suggestions, but certainly not with the intention of discouraging Mr. Hale's attempt. We shall sincerely rejoice at hearing our objections answered; and at finding our apprehensions groundless. The more a plan of this kind is considered and debated before it is brought into action, the greater is its ultimate chance of success; and the remarks which we have made, will not prove wholly worthless, if they call the attention of Mr. Hale and his friends to points, upon which further explanation will be thankfully received.

ART. XIII.—1. *The Tendency of Prevalent Opinions about Knowledge, considered. A Sermon, preached before the University of Cambridge, on Commencement Sunday, July 2d, 1826. By the Rev. Hugh James Rose, M. A., of Trinity College, and Vicar of Horsham, Sussex. Cambridge: Deighton and Sons; and C. and J. Rivington, London. 2s. 1826.*

2. *Prospectus of the London University.*

THE truth of the common maxim “*corruptio optimi pessima*,” with others of a similar kind, depends mainly on the principle; that in the moral as well as in the natural world, the action of any force may be equally exerted in opposite directions. Thus the enlargement of man’s intellectual dominion is in itself a great and indisputable good: but such is the condition of humanity, that this power, like every thing else, which we possess, is obviously capable of being perverted to the worst purposes; and the quantity of the evil must be in exact proportion to the magnitude of the power, which is generated and set in motion. While, therefore, we entirely agree with the proposition, which declares, in the language of the Scriptures, “The wise man is strong,” and again, “Wisdom strengtheneth the wise, more than ten mighty men, that are in the city;” or which says in the words of Bacon, “Knowledge is power;” we think it evident at the same time, that the question as to the *kind* of knowledge which is attained, the objects for which it is sought, and the uses to which it is applied, must acquire a more awful and paramount importance in a direct ratio to its own extent, and the number of its recipients. In the same degree, and for the same reason, as the aberrations of genius are more dangerous than the mistakes of imbecility, as the sarcasm of a Gibbon, or the sophistry of a Voltaire, carry more mischief about them, than the ravings of a Taylor, or the absurdities of a Carlile: the misdirection of knowledge, generally, is fraught with infinitely more peril to a state, than the errors and prejudices of inactive ignorance.

It seems also clear to us, that they, who have most at heart the moral and intellectual advancement of mankind, are precisely the persons, who will watch with the keenest scrutiny, with the most intense solicitude, with apprehensions springing even from their hopes, the prevalent schemes and notions, by which interests so mighty can be affected; and who will be most anxious to attest the sincerity of their zeal, by their attempts to supply deficiencies, to correct abuses, and to prevent the stream from either flowing into a wrong channel, or being prematurely and irreparably lost amid the sands and morasses of idle and unprofitable inquiry;

while they also perceive that the fertility or the destruction accompanying its course, must be a result measured by the volume of the water, and depending on the direction which it takes.

It is with these feelings, and under these impressions, that we proceed to an examination of the most influential opinions on the subject of knowledge, and the most remarkable systems of instruction, at a time, when it is allowed on all hands, that a spirit of intellectual activity exists among us, stronger and more widely extended, than has been exhibited by any other country, or at any former period in our own: and we have rather chosen to introduce our strictures by what we readily allow to be a string of truisms, than to have it supposed for a moment, that we are hostile to the progress of real science; or have any wish whatever to impede the utmost exertions of the human mind, and the fullest development of all its faculties.

We have already stated, that the intellectual activity of the age is universally admitted. This, however, is almost the only point on which the contending parties are agreed: for while the many regard the energy of this spirit, as an unmixed blessing; there are still some, who consider it as a dazzling, but fallacious, advantage, which will ultimately prove a nuisance and a curse to the community. The projectors of the day describe the kind of knowledge, which has lately become fashionable, as the best and most useful which it is possible to administer; yet, there are men who rate it at a far lower estimate, and assert that it has been pursued at the expense of other branches of learning, incomparably superior in intrinsic dignity, and more beneficial in their actual results.

Among the persons of the latter description, may be reckoned Mr. Rose, whose sermons we have prefixed to this article. The topic, which he has chosen, is "the tendency of the prevalent opinions about knowledge;" and his great object is to refute the apostles of practical education and scientific attainments. For this purpose he undertakes to show, that the knowledge in vogue among the projectors and system mongers of the day, is "base mechanical;" that "there is no legitimate object of knowledge, but the improvement of our intellectual and moral being with reference to its ultimate destiny," "nor any other standard of value for knowledge, than the degree in which it promotes that improvement:"—but that at present, "a false view of the objects of knowledge has been taken, namely, immediate utility and present reward, and a false and debasing standard of value erected, namely, public opinion." He appears infinitely to prefer literature to science, and to think the sciences themselves deserving of study and admiration, in proportion as they are pure, speculative, and abstract. Experi-

mental philosophy seems, in his eyes, a sorry substitute and exchange for deep and accurate scholarship; and he considers the direct advantages which can result from any intellectual pursuit, as nothing, in comparison with its reflective efficacy in developing the faculties and purifying the heart.

Our object, however, in the present article, is not so much to canvass the merits of Mr. Rose's sermon, as to examine the state of the dispute between him and his opponents; to ascertain how far he is borne out by facts, and afterwards to introduce some remarks upon certain institutions to which his strictures peculiarly apply, and which appear to deserve a more careful consideration than they have hitherto received.

As to the *facts*, then, we cannot go the whole length with this nervous and uncompromising writer, when he asserts, that "the country, which once, within a few years, produced and gloried in a More, a Norris, a Cudworth, and a Stillingfleet, must blush to confess, that she can hardly name among all her sons, more than a single metaphysical or ethical student; that scholarship of the higher class possesses only a bare and dubious existence; that *pure* literature shares the same neglect; and that every department of intellectual research, which requires time, and thought, and patience, without offering a prospect of immediate advantage, is rejected with a vehemence of anger, and branded as visionary." On the contrary, we are happy in believing, that there are yet among us many sound and excellent divines, many "ripe and good" scholars; many contemplative and profound students, by whom "knowledge is valued for its own sake, and not only for its direct and practical utility." But, that Mr. Rose is right to a considerable extent, is a truth, of which we are more and more confirmed, by the experience of every hour. It is impossible to deny, as long as we speak *in generals*, that the grand object of pursuit is the knowledge of the material universe, as tending, most directly, to add to the conveniences and comforts of life, and to bestow immediate reward on those whose sagacity leads them to discovery themselves, or to profit by the discoveries of others. The prevalent bias of the times, unquestionably, leads towards mechanical and astronomical science. We may trace this tendency in the almost innumerable multitude of patents which have been granted for inventions or improvements in machinery, or for processes connected with the useful arts; in the variety of companies, which two or three years ago burst into existence, for insurance—for mining—for rail-roads—for canals—for the supply of factitious wants, which, in the days of our more homely forefathers, were unfelt and unimagined: in the discourse and habits

of society; in the tone of literature, and more especially in the topics discussed by the Journals, the Reviews, the Magazines, and all other periodical publications, of which it is the common province to reflect, as in a mirror, the manners and feelings of the people. If we look either at the aggregate number of books published, by a reference to the annual, or quarterly, or monthly catalogues; or at the degree of popularity, which is acquired by any single production, we shall find, that the largest proportion of works, and the widest sphere of circulation, must be ascribed to subjects, which are either calculated to afford mere amusement, or have an immediate bearing upon the use and accommodation of animal life. We can hardly give a publication a worse name, as is well known to Mr. Coleridge, and many other writers of very considerable powers, than by calling it *metaphysical*, or by hinting that *metaphysics* are mixed up with its ostensible matter: the case is little better with respect to ethical and logical disquisitions: a volume of poetry is about the most hazardous of literary speculations; and the question of "*cui bono?*" is not unfrequently asked with a shrug and a sneer: while, on the other hand, a treatise on chemistry is bought and read with comparative avidity; for the crudest lucubrations of the political economists, there is, to borrow one of their own phrases, "a steady demand in the market;" and fortunes have been made by a few hundred pages, upon the sublime and momentous topic of domestic cookery.

These effects have arisen from the joint operation of several existing causes; but the principal of them are, First, the natural spirit of a country, distinguished throughout the world for its commerce, its manufactures, its practical enterprise and skill. Second; the increase of luxury and artificial desires, consequent upon the accumulation of wealth. Third; the inherent distinction between the moral and mechanical sciences, inasmuch as the advantages of the one class are palpable at once, and obvious to all mankind, while the benefits of the other are less visible and obtrusive, in the same ratio as they are, in reality, greater and more lasting. Fourth; the accidental splendour thrown around the former department of knowledge, and the new stimulus given to its pursuit by the late magnificent discoveries, the results of which are daily and deservedly regarded with mingled admiration and astonishment. A Fifth, and more remote cause, may perhaps be added, in our reverence for the philosophy of Bacon, of which the character is so eminently inductive and experimental, and of which the chief aim seems, or at least is generally supposed to be, as its founder himself expresses it, "the enlargement of man's dominion over nature." Partial and mistaken views of his

system have very probably been formed : but still the actual consequence has been to ensure a paramount superiority to objective and physical, over metaphysical and subjective studies.

Having thus attempted a general and preliminary sketch of the signs and temper of the times, with reference to knowledge, we shall now hasten to a closer examination of the facts, as they regard *modern systems of popular instruction*.

In speaking of Elementary Schools, the remark, however trite, can scarcely too often be repeated, that reading and writing are the *instruments* and not the *substance* of knowledge, or proper education. It is not enough to furnish boys—and of course girls might be included, but that we have no room to treat of female instruction—with the capacity of acquiring information, without duly initiating them into those kinds of learning, which ought most to be acquired. Now, as far as National Schools are concerned, strict attention is undoubtedly paid to the inculcation of virtuous and religious principles : but when we consider in our minds the whole population of the British Empire, and then apply to it the scheme and extent of existing education, we perceive, or fancy that we perceive, a lamentable chasm or deficiency in the case of the children of those persons—as for example, petty shop-keepers or very small farmers—who are *above* sending them to a Charity School, and have not the means of sending them to a Classical, or even what is called a Commercial Academy. We moreover apprehend, that no adequate preparatory instruction has yet been provided for thousands of a somewhat lower class, who are likely afterwards to enrol themselves as members of a Mechanics' Institute or some other similar establishment appropriated to adults.

The conception of Mechanics' Institutes, to whomsoever it may originally belong, appears enlightened as well as philanthropic. We mean simply the project of teaching, in a cheap and easy method, the application of science to arts and trades, and the theoretical principles, on which practice must ultimately rest, and by which it ought uniformly to be guided. There is something extremely fit to dazzle and engage the mind in thus turning artisans into philosophers, and handicraftsmen into studious inquirers. When we see the means unfolded and brought into play, by which knowledge, the most immediately useful, is thrown into the very grasp of persons who had never before even aspired to its attainment : when we perceive workmen of various descriptions enabled to *instruct themselves* without dependence on the higher classes ; and in establishments placed under their own management and direction, become, as husbands and fathers, more capable of supporting their wives and families, and, as

citizens, more valuable and serviceable to the state, besides securing an innocent and profitable occupation for their leisure hours, we cannot but discern an engine of a two-fold benefit, both from the good which it does, and the vice and idleness which it may prevent.

This is the bright side of the picture. There is of course a dark one too. Few things can be conceived, which require a sounder judgment and a more enlarged experience than the task of founding such institutions upon the proper basis, of confining them within the due limits, and guarding them from corruption and abuse by wise and stable regulations. The best intentions will only produce harm without the most consummate prudence and skill, and it is hard to say, whether the greatest difficulty consists in fixing with exact nicety the scale on which such establishments should be formed, and the views and spirit with which they should be conducted; or in accurately adjusting the lectures and other modes of tuition to the wants and situations of the learners. Associations of this kind may be so constructed as to beget among the members the most mischievous ideas of grandeur and self-importance; and information may be so bestowed, as to cause evils, both moral and intellectual, of which neither the limits nor the consequences can be foreseen. Attempts may, and perhaps ought to be made, not merely to gratify the thirst for scientific instruction upon matters of immediate concern to the mechanics, but to excite in their breasts a modest desire for further improvement, by opening to them by degrees some glimpses of other knowledge, sublimer in its character, and more elevated in its object;—but these advantages can never be obtained without the risk of flying above the level of their capacity, and their previous acquirements; and of inflating their minds by confused and undigested notions upon many departments of intellectual research, with which under their circumstances a thorough acquaintance is impossible. Practice, built upon long habit and observation, may thus be far preferable to crude and imperfect science: and, without constant vigilance, feelings may be engendered among the workmen, evincing not so much the honourable desire of bettering their condition by patient industry, as a hankering discontent—an overweening pride and self-conceit with regard to their intrinsic value and attainments, and a mingled envy and contempt of the masters by whom they are employed, and, in general, of their superiors in external rank, or influence, or wealth.

Whether the dangers and difficulties, here mentioned, have been altogether surmounted in the establishments, which are already in actual operation, we shall be better able to form an

opinion, by looking for a moment at the rise and progress of the Mechanics' Institute in the Metropolis.

The one thing, desirable beyond every other in such an Institution, appears to be, that all should be managed in the most simple, quiet, and unpretending manner; and the one thing most to be avoided, that it should be made a hobby and show-room for the patrons, instead of being wholly a place of profitable study for the artizans. There can never be any need of giving a studied dignity and importance to these establishments; for their natural and inevitable tendency is to exalt the notions of the mechanics quite enough without adventitious aid. Yet we think, that in London—to say nothing of other towns—there has been a vast deal of superfluous ostentation and parade. The real interests of the mechanics have in a certain degree been sacrificed to the glory of heading a procession, and the opportunity of making a speech. When the building for the Institute was begun, and again when it was finished, Dr. Birkbeck took occasion to utter a florid and declamatory harangue about “opening the Temple of Knowledge,” and “accelerating the march of the mind,” with other flowers of rhetoric, of which the beauty and freshness have been somewhat tarnished by the lips through which they have occasionally passed. Mr. Brougham next mounted the rostrum *with the kind permission of the assembly*; and completely identifying himself with its members—among whom he has by the way been enrolled—pronounced a long discourse for the edification of his *fellow-mechanics*, and talked of “*our*” worthy president, “*our*” duties, “*our*” energies, “*our*” resources, and “*our*” prospects. What could be his motive, we shall not endeavour to divine; but does he suppose, that, by this idle and spurious condescension, the workmen will imagine Mr. Brougham to be either reducing, or meaning to reduce, himself to an equality with *their* station? or will they not rather think, that *they* are raised, or intended to be raised, almost to the level of persons who move in the same sphere of life with Mr. Brougham? At the same, or a similar, meeting, Dr. Birkbeck expatiated on the dignity of human nature, and spoke with horror of “*immortal man counterpoising a coal-basket!*” Now, in the name of human improvement, and in furtherance of the dignity of human nature, let science be advanced as far and as fast as may be possible:—but in the mean time, let not the lower classes be disgusted with their toilsome, yet necessary employments. Such language ought at least to be reserved for that golden age, when the progress of knowledge shall have superseded all the humbler kinds of manual or corporeal exertion. For our own parts, we apprehend that this consummation will not be realized, until a complete change

shall have been effected both in the human frame, and in the material universe. At present, it seems almost as sensible to complain of "immortal man" eating, or "immortal man" drinking, or "immortal man" performing the other more degrading offices connected with our physical infirmities and wants. What, too, shall we say of "immortal man" blacking shoes, or cleaning knives and forks, or sweeping the streets, or breaking the stones for the roads under the auspices of Mr. Mac Adam? As long as these things must be done at all, it is surely better that they should be done with a cheerful spirit. We might pursue the subject; but we feel convinced that Dr. Birkbeck,—whom we readily believe to be a man of learning and of excellent intentions, although he may be somewhat too fond of playing the first part in an establishment, which has conferred upon him a notoriety that might not otherwise have fallen to his lot,—will see the propriety of refraining from such expressions at a period, when—whatever may be the case hereafter—there are still gradations in society, and *some* persons must be at the bottom of the scale. There would be infinitely more wisdom in telling the mechanics, that it is not *immortal* man, who counterpoises the coal-basket, but mortal man in his state of trial and probation, before he has put on his immortality; and that, in this, the truest and most philosophical view of human concerns, there is nothing, which can really be degrading, except idleness, or immorality, or that distempered fretfulness, which destroys the individual's own peace of mind, while it is apt to disturb the community of which he is a part.

Mr. Brougham remarks in his "Practical Observations addressed to the Working Classes and their Employers," that "much depends upon a right course being taken at first; proper rules laid down; fit subjects selected for Lectures; good teachers chosen: and that upon all these matters the opinions and wishes of those, who chiefly contribute to found the several institutions, must receive great attention." Yet, if we had any quarrel with the Founder and President of the Mechanics' Institute in London, we might hint, that the "subjects selected for Lectures," even by himself—as for example, "*The Theory of the Winds*,"—have not always been the most appropriate and serviceable in the world; nor the tone of sentiment and style precisely suited to the comprehension of his hearers, or the few opportunities which they can have found for the cultivation of their understandings in early life.

Again, if these Establishments are to be placed, as we generally find them, under the control of the Artizans, some provision ought, we think, to be made, and some guarantee to be afforded, that they will uniformly be devoted to their primary and ostensible

purpose of giving and receiving Lectures, and not turned into any thing which bears, or even resembles, the shape of a British Forum, a Debating Society, or a Spouting Club. If ever this should be the case, the spirit of illegal combination will most probably be fostered, and the whole utility of the Institutions will evaporate in frothy disputes. Mr. Brougham, who appears from many passages in his Pamphlet, to be a most strenuous stickler for the principle, that the management and direction of their Institutes should be left either principally, or entirely, in the hands of the Mechanics, has added in one place, "We have never found any inconvenience from this plan during the twelve months that our Institution in London has been established. In Glasgow, there is a much longer experience in its favour; with this addition, that a contrary plan having at one time been pursued there, *the men ceased to interest themselves in the Lecture, and the Institution declined.*" Mr. Brougham may view the fact thus related, with complacency and satisfaction, as corroborating the system which he recommends: but to us it is rather a demonstration, that these establishments have always a tendency towards becoming mere haranguing societies for the journeymen of commercial and manufacturing towns; and that, without the utmost care, the seeds of abuse and decay will be soon mingled with their constitution. Let not our remark be misinterpreted: we make it, because we sincerely wish them well. We here see—and we regret to see—a proof, that, with some at least of the workmen, the desire of knowledge may be subordinate to the pride of conducting an establishment of their own, to the love of having an Evening Assembly, and hearing themselves talk. But a far stronger instance may be adduced in the meeting, which was previously described in hand-bills, as likely to be of the utmost interest and importance to the Mechanics, and which was very lately convened in the *theatre*—as it is magniloquently and somewhat absurdly called—of the Institute in London: where a large number of persons were congregated for no other apparent purpose, except perhaps the pleasure of debate, than to pass a resolution for supporting the Trades' Newspaper, because it advocated the cause of the working classes, and to discuss the propriety of a scheme, which was very seriously proposed, of forming themselves into Associations upon the plan suggested, and in part reduced to practice, by Mr. Owen, of New Lanark and of Harmony!

The mention, in connection with Mechanics' Institutes, of an enthusiast, who, however philanthropic, is so decidedly at war with the political and ecclesiastical regulations, not only of England, but of every civilized country, which exists, or has existed, leads us to that part of our subject, about which we feel the most

immediate concern,—namely, the quantity of moral and religious instruction which is provided at these, or similar, establishments.

Here, in order to furnish our readers with the most accurate and unimpeachable *data* for the regulation of their opinions, we shall copy an official advertisement, extracted from the Examiner of November the 12th, 1826, and inserted by the committee of the London Mechanics' Institution.

“The public are respectfully informed, that an annual payment of twenty shillings will confer the following important advantages:—

“1. Admission to the lectures, Wednesdays and Fridays in each week.

“2. To the Reading-Room, open daily, from ten in the morning till ten in the evening, and to the use of the Library of Circulation, containing upwards of 2,500 volumes.

“3. To the Elementary Schools for instructions in *Arithmetic, Mathematics, Drawing, French, Geography, and Writing.*”

We thus easily discern of what kind is the education provided for the mechanics. It is very plain, that neither morality nor religion is included in the course. The lectures, again, are appropriated to chemistry, mechanics, the pure and mixed mathematics, and some branches of natural philosophy. But in addition to the lectures and the “School of Arts,” we find, also, that extensive libraries have been formed. Of what books are they composed? Let us hear Mr. Brougham. In one place he says, “the books are of all kinds, with the exception of *theology*, which, from the various sects the men belong to, is of necessity excluded.” In another passage, he makes the same assertion in substance, both with regard to circulating libraries, and also to reading societies and book clubs. In some institutions, too, “original papers upon subjects of science and literature are read at the quarterly meetings, no topics being excluded from discussion except those of a polemical and party nature.” In others, “the men meet every evening, to converse upon literary and scientific subjects, and once a week to lecture; any one who chooses, giving a fortnight’s notice that he will treat on some subject, which he has been studying.” “At these meetings for discussion, papers are read and conversations entertained upon any scientific or literary subject, with two exceptions only, controversial divinity and party politics.” Thus, we see, that religion is pretty well put *hors de combat*: might we not say, that it is absolutely scouted? The mechanics may neither read about it, nor write about it, nor talk about it. They are not only *not* encouraged, but they are strictly forbidden. For the absence of religion, Mr. Brougham expresses no regret; but with politics, as we shall very soon have an opportunity of perceiving, he is by no means disposed to part so easily.

Another engine of popular education is the publication of cheap works: these have sometimes been produced entire and at once, but more frequently they have been published by degrees in parts, or numbers; the latter method being better "suited to the circumstances of the classes, whose income is derived from wages." The distress which has lately occurred in the book-selling, as well as in most other trades, has, for the present, inflicted a terrible check upon this system of instruction; but we may refer to Mr. Brougham for information as to what it was when in active operation, and, therefore, as to what it will probably be again, whenever it shall be resuscitated into its former vigour. He tells us—

"The circulation of cheap works of a merely amusing kind, as well as of those connected with the arts, is at present (in 1824-5,) very great in England; *those of an aspect somewhat more forbidding, though at once moral, interesting, and most useful, is very limited*; while in Scotland there is a considerable demand for them."

And again—

"In looking over the list of those cheap publications, which are unconnected with the arts, we certainly do not find many that are of a very instructive cast; and here it is that something may be done by way of encouragement."

Soon after he goes on to say—

"Lord John Russell, in his excellent and instructive speech upon parliamentary reform, delivered in 1822, stated, that an 'establishment was commenced a few years ago, by a number of individuals, with a capital of not less than a million, for the purpose of printing standard works at a cheap rate;' and he added, that it had been 'very much checked in its operation by one of those acts for the suppression of knowledge, which were passed in the year 1819, although one of its rules was not to allow the vendors of its works to sell any book on the political controversies of the day.' The only part of this plan which appears at all objectionable, is the *restriction upon politics*. Why should not political, as well as all other works, be published in a cheap form and in numbers. To allow, or rather to induce the people to take part in discussions upon political economy is not merely safe, but most wholesome for the community, and yet some points connected with them are matter of pretty warm contention in the present times; but these may be freely handled, it seems, with safety; indeed, unless they are so handled, such subjects cannot be discussed at all. Why then may not *every topic of politics, party as well as general*, be treated of in cheap publications? It is highly useful to the community that the true principles of the constitution, ecclesiastical and civil, should be well understood by every man, who lives under it. The great interests of civil and religious liberty are mightily promoted by such wholesome instruction; but the good order of society gains to the full as much by it. The peace of the country, and the sta-

bility of the government, could not be more effectually secured than by the universal diffusion of this kind of knowledge. The abuses, which through time have crept into the practice of the constitution, the errors committed in its administration, and the improvements, which a change of circumstances require, even in its principles, may most fitly be expounded in the same manner."

Now, we have no objection to the doctrine here inculcated by Mr. Brougham. We think, that in a free country it is manifestly impossible, whether it be desirable or not, that the working mechanics, or the lower classes in general, should be prevented from reading about politics, or from disputing upon political subjects. The newspaper comes with the Sunday morning; they *can* read it, and they *will* read it. In fact, the whole reading of our English artisans may, for the most part, fairly be summed up in the "Mechanics' Magazine," and the "Mechanics' Register," some cheap publications of a lighter cast, such as "The Mirror," and the weekly journals. But we venture to ask Mr. Brougham, if he is so anxious to admit politics, with what consistency can he exclude religion? With what reason will he open the door wide for the one, and shut it in the face of the other with something like disdain? Are the points of disagreement so much more numerous, or the controversies and contentions likely to be so much more frequent and violent in religion than in politics? Does it not seem absurd, that a man should be prohibited from reading a religious treatise in his club room, because there happens to be another man in the same room who is of a different sect? Why, in short, should theology alone be kept out by a positive regulation, when works upon every other topic of human inquiry are liable to admission or rejection according to the votes of the members in any of these establishments for the instruction of our mechanics?

Such, however, is the case with respect to adults among the working classes of our population: we shall now ascend in the scale of society, and examine how far and by what measures the same system is continued.

Here we would willingly say something of the various literary and scientific institutions which have been formed in the metropolis and elsewhere for the benefit of the middle orders, as for instance, clerks and other persons who are employed during the day in offices or counting-houses, and who are desirous of devoting some part of the evening to the improvement of their minds. It would be worth while to make a short investigation as to the kind of lectures which are given, and the description of books which furnish the libraries with their contents. The inquiry, too, might have a double degree of interest, as these institutions are intended for the instruction of both sexes. But if

we once began with concerns so numerous, and so generally extended through the kingdom, we might find it very difficult to stop; and our present object will be more speedily and completely attained by hastening forward to the last and most striking project connected with education, namely, the proposed establishment of a new University in London.

The idea, however, of a new University is far from original. There is an old treatise extant, entitled "*The Third Universitie of England*:" and a few years ago, when it was suggested, that an university might be founded at York, Lord Fitzwilliam offered, as it is said, to subscribe the magnificent sum of £50,000 for that express purpose. In London itself, too, a similar plan has been started more than once, yet it is curious to observe, that the earlier propositions of this nature were chiefly sarcastic and ironical, and seem intended to show that London is a place, where the sciences of folly and debauchery are most likely to be taught.

We re-quote the following lines, from a contemporary publication. They are in an old play by Thomas Randolph, entitled "*The Muses' Looking Glass*."

" Oh ! I have thought on't—I will straightway build
A free-school here in London—a free-school
For th' education of young gentlemen ;
To study how to drink, and take tobacco,
To swear, to roar, to dice, to drab, to quarrel.
'Twill be the great gymnasium of the realm ;
The frontisterium of Great Brittainy !"

In the same spirit there is an amusing paper, written by the Earl of Cork, in the *Connoisseur* (No. 17.) proving the city of London to be an university, and the arts and sciences taught there in greater perfection than at Oxford or Cambridge. It begins thus—

" Though many historians have described the city of London (in which we may include Westminster) with great accuracy, yet they have not set it out in the full light, which at present it deserves :—they have not distinguished it *as a university*. Paris is a university, Dublin is a university, even Moscow is a university. But London has not been honoured with that title. I will allow our metropolis to have been originally intended only as a city of trade ; and I will farther own, that scarce any sciences, except such as are purely mercantile, were cultivated in it, till within these last thirty years. But from that period of time, I may say a whole army, as it were, of arts and sciences, have amicably marched in upon us, and have fixed themselves as auxiliaries to our capital. The four greater faculties, theology, law, medicine, and philosophy, which are taught in other universities, are in their highest perfection here."

Exemplifications are then made with much mock gravity in the cases of "logic," "eloquence," "music," "ethics, or moral philosophy," "experimental philosophy," and "hydraulics," all intended to expose the vices, the contentions, and the drunkenness of the inhabitants of the capital in those days.

But it is time to proceed in sober seriousness to the establishment which is now in progress. We shall, perhaps, better understand its nature by casting a retrospective glance at the similar projects which have preceded, and, unless we are very much mistaken, helped to produce it. The chief of these is undoubtedly the Chrestomathia of Mr. Bentham, "being the Design of an Institution proposed to be set on foot under the name of the Chrestomathic Day School, or Chrestomathic School for the Extension of the new System of Instruction to the Higher Branches of Learning, for the use of the Middling and Higher Ranks of Life," with a second part, "containing a new Nomenclature and Classification of the Sciences, grounded on the Application of the Logical Principle of exhausted bifurcate Analysis to the Moral Principle of general Utility." In many respects relating both to the form and the spirit, the Chrestomathic Day School of Mr. Bentham is the exact prototype and counterpart of the London University of Messrs. Brougham and Campbell. The plan of the former is divided into five stages, and comprehends a very extensive list of sciences. They belong principally, however, to mechanics, chemistry, or natural philosophy; and there are some very remarkable omissions, with regard to which the model, as we shall presently discover, has been since copied with very tolerable fidelity. Thus "private ethics or morals (controverted points)" can find no place in any of the stages on the ensuing grounds, "time of life too early," and "admittance pregnant with exclusion." Divinity, for the same reasons, is excluded in the lump. But then we have large amends in the introduction of other branches of learning altogether new. A single specimen of what is added may surely teach us no longer to regret what has been thrown away. In the fourth stage, there occurs the novel and sublime science dignified by the winning and felicitous title of Phthisozoics, and explained as "*the art of destruction applied to noxious animals.*" On this memorable occasion Mr. Bentham has the subjoined note.

"(Phthisozoics.) From two Greek words; one of which signifies to *destroy*; the other an *animal*:—the art of destroying such of the inferior animals, as, in the character of natural *enemies*, threaten destruction or damage,—to himself, or to such animals, from which, in the character of natural *servants* or *allies*, it is in man's power to extract useful service,—is an art, not much less necessary than ~~that~~ of preserving, and restor-

ing to health, those his natural *friends*.—Animals which, either immediately or mediately, as above, are regarded as noxious to man, are commonly included under the general appellation of vermin. The Complete Vermin-Killer is the title of an old established book.”—*Chrestomathia*, vol. i. p. 50.

Hence, it would really appear, that to become a “*complete vermin-killer*,” a destroyer of rats and bugs, is deemed a more valuable acquisition for a youth, than to be a proficient in moral and religious knowledge. This is no burlesque—no caricature—no exaggeration of Mr. Bentham’s *foible*: it is a quotation, extracted fairly and literally from his own book. We could laugh, we could not help laughing, but that our disposition to ridicule must be lost in unmixed sorrow, if such is the spirit of modern instruction, and such are the illuminati of the day.

Next to Mr. Bentham comes his friend and disciple Mr. Mill, who, be it remarked, is also upon the list of the council of the New London University. In the article “*Education*,” which is inserted in the Supplement to the Encyclopædia Britannica, after lavishing his praises upon the Chrestomathic scheme, and speaking in disparagement of older systems, this gentleman proceeds to observe:—

“The celebrated German philosopher, Wolf, remarks the aversion of the universities to all improvement, as a notorious thing, founded upon adequate motives, in the following terms—‘Non adeo impune turbare licet scholarum quietem, et docentibus lucrosam, et discentibus jucundam.’ *Wolfii Log. Dedic.* p. 2.

“But though such and so great are the evil tendencies, which are to be guarded against in associated seminaries of education; evil tendencies, which are apt to be indefinitely increased, when they are *united with an ecclesiastical establishment*, because whatever the vices of the ecclesiastical system, the universities have in that case an interest to bend the whole force of their education to the support of them all, and the human mind can only be rendered the friend of abuses, in proportion as it is vitiated, intellectually or morally, or both; it must, notwithstanding, be confessed, that there are great advantages in putting it in the power of youth to obtain all the branches of their education in one place; even in assembling a certain number of them together, when the principle of emulation acts with powerful effect; and the carrying on the complicated process according to a regular plan, under a certain degree of discipline, and with the powerful spur of publicity. All this ought not to be rashly sacrificed; nor does there appear to be any insuperable difficulty in devising a plan for the attainment of all these advantages, without the evils which have more or less adhered to all the collegiate establishments which Europe has yet enjoyed.”

In succeeding years the rage for new plans and establishments of education increased with an accelerated ratio. In lectures, in

pamphlets, in letters addressed to the editors of different journals, projects were proposed for building a grand place of comprehensive instruction in London. The following advertisement appeared in the Morning Chronicle, Friday, Jan. 21st, 1825.

“At a meeting of gentlemen, held on Wednesday, the 19th instant, the plan of an institution for providing schools for the instruction of youth upon economical terms, and after the plan of the most approved public seminaries, so as to enable the middle class of society in London and its vicinity, to give their sons a liberal education, was considered, and adopted, resolutions entered into for the purpose of forming a society for carrying it into effect, under the title of ‘The London Academical Institution.’ The plans of the direction and management of this institution are under consideration, and will be laid before the public in a few days.”

Mr. Brougham, too, writes, in speaking of the higher classes—

“The present public seminaries must be enlarged; and *some of the greater cities of the kingdom, especially the metropolis, must not be left destitute of the regular means within themselves of scientific education.*”

Shortly afterwards, Mr. Campbell wrote his letter to the Times, suggesting a London College or University; and the truth appears to be, that the scheme occurred, about the same time, to Messrs. Brougham and Campbell and their friends, to found a London University or College, and to some Unitarian and other Dissenters, to found a London Academic Institution; much in the same way, to compare small things with great, as the discovery of the fluxionary calculus, brought to their profound minds by the progress of mathematical science, was made almost simultaneously by Newton and by Leibnitz. The consequence was, that the two parties met, and the two projects were combined; but it is very doubtful whether the interests of true knowledge will be benefited by the coalition.

We have thus traced the establishment through its several stages and gradations, until it has assumed the full honours of its present name. A day-school, an academic institution, a college, an university—all these it has already been in turn; and it is impossible to affirm which, if any of them, it is destined to remain. Our historical statement, however slight, may be of use, as it affords the real key to the anomalies and defects, which are but too apparent in the frame and ground-work of the institution.

The first and by far the most lamentable of these, is the deficiency already so often remarked, the total omission of religion, or, if the names sound better in the ears of the founders and directors, of divinity, or theology, in a scheme of education, which pretends to be as comprehensive and “*as universal as possible.*”

The absence of the statue of Brutus from the Roman procession was once accounted to be something ominous and fatal: but what shall we say when we look over the catalogue of sciences, and discover that religion, the end and crown of all, is alone wanting from the circle? In the case of Mechanics' Institutes, there is some shadow of excuse: the patrons of those establishments may say, "Our object is an open and a legitimate one; it is the scientific instruction of the people, in order to give them power and facility in the performance of their daily employments: to this object we confine ourselves, and we profess to do nothing more: their moral and religious education we leave to the government and the clergy." Even Mr. Bentham may assert, in defence of his *Chrestomathia*, that it is not religion alone which he excludes; that he also prevents literary composition, and ethics, and criticism, and rhetoric, and national and international law, and even "the all-directing art and science, logic, by some called metaphysics," from interfering with his "prophylactics," his "zohygiantics," and his "phthisozoics:" he may, besides, affirm that his day-school was intended merely for boys; that it was not called an university, nor meant to be an university; nor was the school of education declared to be "as universal as possible." But now listen to Mr. Campbell.

"I exhort the friends of the plan to give it the name of an University. I have been told that we ought not to call the proposed place an university, but a school; because we do not intend to ask for a power of conferring degrees. But why call it by any other name than what it will deserve? Now a school generally means a seminary for mere boys, and an university means, both in common parlance and in the dictionary, not a place for getting degrees, but for getting instruction *as universally as possible*. If there be ridicule, then, in disputing about words, let it fall exclusively on those who would distort their etymology. I would by no means abandon the title.

"In compliance with the wishes of several persons, whose favour towards the proposed new establishment for education in London it was thought expedient to propitiate, the projectors of a London University agreed to alter its title to that of a College.

"It is expressly understood, however, that not the slightest intention of altering the nature or extent of the establishment is implied in the change of name. *It is still intended to be a place of as universal education, as means can be found to make it.*"

But to place the matter more fully before our readers, we shall examine the reasons which are given for the omission, with the advantages which are alleged to result from it; and we shall then see how far they counterbalance the positive evil, the moral and intellectual mischief of separating religion from the whole comprehensive range of human knowledge.

We remember, when the first public meeting was held at the City of London Tavern, for the purpose of taking into consideration the propriety of establishing an university in London, to have heard Mr. Brougham deliver a violent and dogmatic oration, in which this topic was his principal theme, and at the end of which he had apparently assured himself, if he had not convinced his hearers, that he had set the matter completely at rest. As the assembly had evidently come together with the intention of applauding one side, and not of listening to both, Mr. Brougham flourished his arms in triumph, and remained master of the field. Yet we humbly conceive that he sang his psalm before the victory was gained; and although it would have been obviously unwise for any man to have then risked the character of a good cause, by advocating it among a set of persons who, in their liberal and enlightened notions about the advancement of knowledge, would have made it a point of honour to hoot him down, we are quite sure that a disputant of much lower abilities than those which Mr. Brougham possesses, might have so managed the controversy, as to have reminded him of the people mentioned by the Greek historian, who thought the battle concluded almost before it was begun, and whose enemies rushed upon them and routed them, at the very moment when they were erecting their trophy. To us, at least, the arguments adduced on this subject by Mr. Brougham and his partizans have always appeared about the most shallow and unsatisfactory which have ever been palmed upon the public easiness of belief, and disposition to take things for granted when roundly and plausibly affirmed. We may fairly state them to be as follows.

The first argument is the one which we have already seen used by Mr. Bentham, in his peculiar language, of "admittance pregnant with exclusion;" namely, that if religion be taught in the university, or, in other words, if the university be connected and identified with peculiar tenets on the subject of religion, a large number of persons will be excluded, who would otherwise have been glad to partake of its advantages. But we doubt the fact: we are rather inclined to think that the proportion of scholars who will stay away on account of the want of some positive religion, will be numerically greater than of those who would absent themselves because the doctrines of the Church of England are avowedly taught. Yet, for the sake of argument, let us suppose it to be otherwise: we would ask, why two or more collegiate institutions could not be founded in London, if the demand for a new university is so loud and general as has been pretended? There would be no want of professors; or the same professors in human sciences might lecture in both places at different hours, or on

different days; and connect with their several departments of knowledge that natural religion which is common to all Christian sects; while the particular views, on the basis of which each college or university was built, might be separately expounded by particular teachers. We would much rather see a "Dissenters' University" established in London, in the next street to an university for the members of the church, and in fair and open opposition to it, or even a "Deists' University" instituted in the same way, than one, like the present, which professes to admit all the other ingredients of knowledge, and rejects religion as something unwholesome and unpalatable. Nay, we would rather see the professors of various religious persuasions attend at times respectively appropriated to them,—although we are aware that this plan is not without many and serious inconveniences,—than we would have to remark the portentous chasm which is now left.

But it is said that *one* large institution for the purposes of collegiate education has this indisputable and striking superiority over two or more smaller ones, that all the scholars will have the benefit of a fuller library, a richer museum, and a more complete philosophical apparatus for illustration and experiments, than could be afforded by any single establishment on the other system. In answer to this assertion, we would say that a library, a museum, and a philosophical apparatus, abundantly sufficient for all practical uses, can neither be very expensive, nor very difficult to be procured. Here we have the authority of Mr. Brougham himself. He shows us that libraries, of very considerable extent, are actually possessed by the *mechanics* of several of our towns, where the population does not consist of many thousands. It must be recollected, too, that the students for the most part will provide their own books. A museum, in a city like London, where there are so many at hand, must be rather an ornamental than a necessary adjunct to the university: and with regard to a philosophical apparatus, Mr. Brougham writes—

"I reckon a small sum for apparatus. Great progress may be made in teaching with very cheap and simple experiments. Indeed, some of the most important, if not the most showy, are the least costly and complicated. By far the grandest discoveries in natural science were made with hardly any apparatus. A pan of water and two thermometers were the machinery that, in the skilful hands of Black, detected latent heat. A crown's worth of glass, three penny worth of salt, a little chalk, and a pair of scales, enabled the same great philosopher to found the system of modern chemistry, by tracing the existence and the combinations of fixed air: with little more machinery the genius of Scheele created the materials of which the fabric was built, and anticipated some of the discoveries that have illustrated a later age. A prism, a lens, and

a sheet of pasteboard, enabled Newton to unfold the composition of light, and the origin of colours. Franklin ascertained the nature of lightning with a kite, a wire, a bit of riband, and a key: to say nothing of the great chemist of our own day, of whose most useful, perhaps most philosophical discovery, the principle might have been traced with the help of a common wire fire-guard. Even the elements of mechanics may be explained with apparatus almost as cheap and simple. There cannot be a doubt that a compendious set of machines may be constructed to illustrate, at a very cheap price, a whole course of lectures."

There might even be a library, a museum, and a philosophical apparatus for lectures, common to more than one college in London, while the studies and exercises of each were kept apart. We do not say that such a plan is desirable, but we do say that it is a less evil than the total want of religious instruction.

2. The next argument is, that to connect a new university with religion, is to create a source of endless and acrimonious disputes. It is urged that men may differ upon other sciences without anger or bitterness, or intemperance, but not upon religion. One professor, for instance, we are told, may teach one system of chemistry, and another professor may teach another, yet each may retain a strong respect and regard for the abilities and character of his rival: and then, in contrast to this mutual good-will, there comes some stale and common-place taunt about the "*odium theologicum*." Again we might answer, the facts are erroneously stated; but if we suppose them to be altogether true, what are they to the purpose? Who has ever wished that a new university should be made an arena for the controversies which will very possibly occur, as long as men are in earnest about their religious faith? The real and only question is, whether it would be better to have separate seminaries, in which the distinct tenets of various sects might be separately inculcated; or *one* of larger dimensions, and a more ambitious character, in which the religion of every sect is alike prohibited.

3. Oh! but say some of the advocates for the academy at the end of Gower Street—"we do not mean to exclude religion—our prohibition only extends to *contested points in theology*." It may be remarked, that a dislike to *religion* is never expressed by these gentlemen. "Theology" or "divinity" is invariably the word. But we should be glad to know what is the difference? we shall be glad to know, what points of theology are *uncontested*, and how much of religion will remain when the contested points of theology are taken away? "You must not leave Church of Englandism," says Mr. Bentham—and so say the Dissenters in general: "you must not leave the belief in the divinity or atonement of Jesus Christ," say the Unitarians:—"you must not leave the belief in

the Christian miracles," says the Deist:—"you must not leave the belief in a God," says the Atheist. To what point, then, will the directors of the new university advance?—at what point will they stop?—and what line of demarcation will they draw? Is their establishment opened to persons of *all* opinions, or is it not? Will they admit the Socinian, the Jew, the Infidel, Deistical, or Atheistical, or will they not? These questions must be answered. Have they settled the matter in their own minds? and do they see the dilemma to which they will inevitably be reduced? We should have thought our modern education-mongers to have been involved in mere confusion and uncertainty of ideas, but that we heard Mr. Brougham, in his tavern oration, talking upon these points with a hardihood, which would have been wonderfully amusing on any other subject; and very gravely insinuating that the projected college might justly claim the title of being the most religious university in the world, although it *had no professorship of theology*, since it was open to all religions, and had, besides, a tendency to prevent religious disputes. Clearly, the most effectual way to prevent religious disputes is, to have no religion; as the best cure for the tooth-ache is extraction of the tooth. For the rest, "*open to all, and influenced by none*," is the motto of a newspaper; perhaps Mr. Brougham will adopt it, as far as religion is concerned, for his most religious university. Yet there is one in Shakspeare, which, with a little alteration, might be rendered still more applicable:—"I will get Peter Quince to write a ballad of this dream; and it shall be called Bottom's Dream, because it hath no bottom."

The remaining arguments are, that the other sciences may be taught equally well without the introduction of theology; that physical knowledge has, of itself, a tendency to inspire religious feelings, instead of causing infidelity; and that religion is best taught at home, under the superintendence of parents. It will be more convenient to take these propositions into consideration, at the same time that we examine the positive and immediate disadvantages which must result from the exclusion of religion in a scheme of comprehensive education, than to sift and winnow them by a previous and separate scrutiny. To that examination, then, we shall now direct our attention.

We had really imagined, that if any one point was settled on the subject of the intellectual world, it was the close connexion of all the sciences, and the mutual light which they throw upon each other. Among almost innumerable passages which occur, both in ancient and modern writers, we select the following sentences from Bishop Horsley. "The sciences are said, and they are truly said, to have that mutual connexion, that any one of them

may be better understood for an insight into the rest. *And there is perhaps no branch of knowledge which receives more illustration from all the rest, than the science of religion.*" But, upon looking again, we find that we might have chosen an authority infinitely more to the purpose; namely, the identical prospectus lately issued by the council of the London University. It says, that they are endeavouring to establish "an institution of such magnitude, as to combine *the illustration and ornament, which every part of knowledge derives from every other*, with the advantage which accrues to all from the outward aids and instruments of libraries, museums, and apparatus." Again, it talks of a seminary, where the most eminent places in education may be restored to their natural rank among the ultimate and highest objects of pursuit. Yet, in the "institution of such magnitude," religion is left out, as if it were incapable of either bestowing or receiving any part of the assistance, illustration, and ornament, which *every* part of knowledge derives from every other; and in the seminary, where the most eminent places in education are to be restored to their natural rank, religion has no rank or station at all. We pass over the nonsense about restoring a *place* to a *rank*; because the object, which we have at this moment in view, is a very serious and important one; namely, to show that the separation of religion from human knowledge, inflicts a deep injury upon *both*.

It inflicts a deep injury upon human knowledge, because the truest wisdom, and the most exalted lessons, which can be drawn from the metaphysical or physical sciences, are of a religious nature. The rest are, in comparison, the mere husk of philosophy, and we are sincerely of opinion, that

" —the poor Indian, whose untutor'd mind
Sees God in clouds, and hears him in the wind,"

is a far more rational and intelligent being than the Sciologist, who pretends to survey all the phenomena of the material and intellectual universe, and then stops at second causes. But Mr. Brougham says, in his pamphlet addressed to the mechanics,

"Happily the time is past and gone, when *bigots* could persuade mankind that the lights of philosophy were to be extinguished as dangerous to religion; and when *tyrants* could proscribe the instructors of the people as enemies to their power. It is preposterous to imagine that the enlargement of our acquaintance with the laws which regulate the universe, can dispose to unbelief. *It may be a cure for superstition—intolerance* it will be a most certain cure: but a pure and true religion is nothing to fear from the greatest expansion which the understanding can receive by the study either of matter, or of mind. The more widely science is diffused, the better will the Author of all things be known, and the less will the people be tossed to and fro by the slight of men and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive."

Agreeing, as we do, with the substance of these remarks, we shall not take notice of their tone, otherwise than by printing two or three of the expressions in *Italics*. But we shall take leave to turn Mr. Brougham's battery against himself. With what face can a man, who writes in this manner, assert either virtually, or in express terms, that the sciences may be taught equally well, without reference to theology? We can tell Mr. Brougham, that natural philosophy is likely to lead to belief or unbelief, exactly in proportion as it is, or is not, connected with theology at every stage of the pupil's progress. Yet, by the very constitution of his projected university, there is a great gulf fixed between theology and science. But, if natural religion is to be inculcated in conjunction with natural philosophy, in that case a material departure is at once made from the spirit of the plan, the fundamental principle of the university; or it becomes evident, that the design is not to exclude theology, or natural religion, but merely to prohibit Christianity. Tom Paine himself affirms, "all the sciences should be studied *theologically*;" here we coincide with Paine to the very letter; but we wish to carry the observation much farther than he would be disposed to go. We assert, that the physical sciences not only lose their highest use, and interest, and importance, when they are disjoined from natural religion; but, that they are necessarily connected, and the observation applies with tenfold force to the *moral and political* sciences, with the doctrines of *revealed* religion. Mr. Brougham has asked—for we well recollect the substance of his question, although we do not affect to quote the exact words—what can points of divinity have to do with discussions about the elements of material objects—about acids and alkalis—about quartz and mica? Yet he must surely know, that natural philosophy and chemistry have been brought forward to disprove the resurrection of the body, and that modern systems of geology have an obvious bearing upon the Mosaic account of the creation and the flood.

But the matter requires a more minute investigation. We shall, therefore, mention the several departments of study, which are included in the course of the London University; and then see, whether they can be adequately taught without reference to religion, both natural and revealed. We confidently defy the projectors and defenders of this new institution to maintain the affirmative. We challenge them to a discussion of the proposition, as being one which is well worthy of notice in a merely speculative point of view; while it also deeply and essentially affects the best interests of mankind. And be it remarked, that the question now put is not, to what conclusion the mind must come, as to either natural or revealed religion, but whether it be possible, fully and

properly, to expound the departments of study embraced by the scheme of the London University, without touching both upon the one and the other? This simple inquiry, as it appears to us, involves the whole character of the system; and by its determination the institution must stand or fall. We shall take the studies as they are at present; although our case might be strengthened by the consideration that their number, according to the prospectus, is liable to be indefinitely augmented.

These departments of knowledge are thirty-two, comprised under eight general heads, among which, it must be here superfluous to say, that the word Religion, or Theology, is not to be found. The *first* of these is Language. Now, what lecturer or professor, upon the face of the globe, will dare to commit himself by the declaration, that it is possible to take an adequate and comprehensive survey of language, either philosophically or historically, without paying some regard to its origin or structure; or to regard its origin and structure, without examining whether it be the discovery of man, or the gift of God; or to settle this controversy without considering, whether all languages were the same in the earliest ages of the human race; and, if so, how and from what causes the difference has arisen; or, again, to do any one of these things without making some reference to the written word, which treats of the speech of Adam, and the tower of Babel? The absurdity of such a declaration, if it were made, would be beneath the notice of a school-boy.

The fifth head—since for reasons, which will presently appear, we do not intend to proceed regularly through the list—embraces the “Moral Sciences,” which are specified as being—1. “Moral and Political Philosophy.” 2. Jurisprudence, including International Law. 3. English Law, with (perhaps) separate Lectures on the Constitution. 4. Roman Law.” With the logical accuracy of this extraordinary enumeration of the moral sciences, we shall not interfere; but we ask, how any professor, how any person of common sense, can disjoin the study of ethics from all religious, or theological speculations? how, without inquiries about the accountability of man to a superior being—to whatever conclusions they may lead—he can arrange and settle his ideas as to the foundations of right and wrong—the nature of *duty*, the meaning of the word “*ought*?” Like the ancient sages, or, rather like the Philosopher Square, recorded in Tom Jones, he may prate about prudence, utility, and the unalterable fitness of things; but he will never ascertain even his own notions upon the merest elements of ethical philosophy, without either admitting, or rejecting, the existence, the superintendence, and the moral government of a Deity. But farther, to talk of a professorship

for "*English Law, with (perhaps) separate Lectures on the Constitution,*" without noticing the religion of the country, and the religious establishment connected with the state, is so monstrous a piece of folly, that it would be scarcely a less one to waste more words upon its exposure.

The sixth head is "*History.*" And it is seriously proposed to give lectures upon history, where one vast branch is entirely ecclesiastical; and where the principal events of the other two branches, namely, civil and military history, have almost invariably some bearing upon religion, either in their causes or their consequences, without taking the character of that religion into account, and expressing some opinion upon religious topics! We shall not insult the understandings of our readers by adding another syllable.

The other heads, which we have not already mentioned, relate to the mathematical, physical, metaphysical, political, economical and medical sciences. We have to offer one important remark, which is applicable to them all. There is not one of them, which has not been made, and which is not daily made, the instrument of scientific infidelity. The anatomist attacks the foundation of all moral responsibility, by tracing to a purely material origin the phenomena of thought; and builds a scheme of necessity upon the supposed structure and functions of the brain. The cranio-logist, or phrenologist, does much the same thing; sometimes, perhaps, without any such consciousness or design; for many a man publishes a system without perceiving the consequences of his own doctrine. A metaphysician, like Hume, will endeavour to persuade us, that a belief in the Christian miracles is utterly irrational from the constitution of the human mind; or he will attempt to reduce man to a mere machine of a more ingenious and complicated frame than other animate or inanimate bodies, by destroying the freedom of the will. The mathematician and natural philosopher will attribute the wonders of the universe to mechanical agency—to fortuitous concurrences, the possibility of which he will calculate by the doctrine of chances; to the necessary concatenation of causes and effects. It is needless farther to illustrate the argument, by a reference to political economy, or geology, or chemistry. In a word, it is a peculiar characteristic of the scepticism of the day, that it draws its choicest and most numerous weapons from the armoury of science. Disquisitions upon verbal criticism, or the historical authenticity of the sacred books, require some degree of learning and studious research: besides, the champions of Christianity have so well disposed of this part of the controversy, as to have driven from the field the most acute and formidable of its antagonists. But,

on the other hand, a slight and superficial acquaintance with the physical sciences is now so common an attainment, that hundreds of sciolists can shoot off some philosophical popgun against the rock of ages.

It should also be borne in mind, that the natural bias of youth is almost always towards scepticism. And such is the case, not merely because, as Bacon says, "a little philosophy inclines us to atheism, and a great deal of philosophy carries us back to religion:" but youth has an intellectual bias against religion, because it would humble the arrogance of the understanding; and a moral bias against it, because it would check the self-indulgence of the passions. In the same degree, youth has a directly opposite bias in favour of scientific infidelity; because it seems to emancipate the mind from superstition and prejudice; and because it lays few restraints upon the gratification of the desires.

Here, therefore, we perceive in what way the separation of religion from human knowledge inflicts a deep injury upon the former. This unnatural estrangement deprives religion of that peculiar glory which consists in crowning and harmonizing all the departments of intellectual study, and elevating them to their highest dignity and use, while it also cripples its means of defence against the shafts of argument and ridicule which are launched from the quiver of shallow science or mistaken philosophy. The enthusiast may fanatically imagine that profane learning is unnecessary or hurtful to the teacher of religion; but the more enlightened theologian will look upon the whole world of nature and art, the whole range of literature, of science, as a commentary upon the word of God, and will be aware that he can never be completely prepared to fight the good fight of faith, unless he be armed at all points with human knowledge, as well as with divine truth. The true interests of both are identified; nor can we conceive a more miserable system than one which, if universally acted upon, would provide for England, in the next generation, ministers of religion deficient in human learning, and men of learning destitute of religion.

Here also we may observe that the religion which is likely to be instilled at home, and under the superintendence of parents, must be a sorry substitute for the lessons of professed scholars, whose lives are devoted to intellectual pursuits. We by no means deny the necessity, or undervalue the power, of domestic inculcation of religious principles: we are well convinced that such principles cannot be impressed too early, or too carefully, upon the heart and understanding of the child. But we must recollect, that the proposed establishment is *not* a preparatory day-school, *is not* a seminary intended for the tuition of young gentlemen

about seven or eight years of age, but an University—or, as Mr. Campbell explains the word, a place of universal education for persons of all ages, and all opinions. It is idle, in such a case, to talk of the religious instruction which the parents can afford: for when we look at things as they really are, who will these parents be? In general, and at best, they will be bankers, merchants, or tradesmen of respectability;—men who may be very sincere and very rational believers in Christianity, yet who will probably have taken up their system of faith upon practical grounds; and who will therefore be unable to refute scientific objections, or satisfy the scruples of a young sceptic, although their sound good sense may be a sufficient antidote to the effect of such scruples upon themselves. Science must be opposed to science: the excellent advice of an honest soap-boiler, or the pious exhortations of an honest soap-boiler's wife, will be but an unequal match for the partial facts and subtle plausibilities of an infidel metaphysician, or chemist, or physiologist. The inevitable conclusion is, that religion and human knowledge should be taught in conjunction—should be engrained together on the intellect, and accompany each other through all the process of scholastic education. We wish to see religion considered as the Alpha and Omega—the beginning and end of wisdom; not as a dark and repulsive mystery, placed in opposition to it. We wish to see the knowledge of the Deity in education, what the Deity himself is in the Universe—the directing and vivifying principle of the whole.

It may be said, that if scientific works are written on the side of infidelity, their influence will be more than counteracted by others written on the side of religion; particularly in a country where such high premiums are offered for orthodox exertions. This may be, or may not be. We have no apprehensions that error will obtain a lasting or general triumph over truth: we simply dread that scepticism may obtain a temporary hold upon individual minds during the inexperience of youth, and in the hey-day of early dissipation. It is not enough that books are written; there must be also a willingness to read them, and a disposition fully and dispassionately to weigh and appreciate their contents. At any rate, is the religious character of so little importance, as to be trusted to the chapter of accidents? Why must the hazard be incurred? or why is the scheme of education so woefully incomplete?

As to parental guidance, we find, that if the anticipations of the projectors are realized, there will be cases in which it cannot possibly be at hand for the members of the new London University.

We quote again from the Prospectus.

“For the good effects expected in other seminaries from discipline,

the council put their trust in the power of home, and the care of parents, to whom in this Institution, which is equally open to youth of every religious persuasion, the important duty of religious education is necessarily, as well as naturally entrusted. That care, always the best, wherever it can be obtained, will assuredly be adequate to every purpose in the case of the residents of London, who must at first be the main foundation of the establishment. When its reputation attracts many pupils *from the country and the colonies*, those means of private instruction and domestic superintendence may be adopted, which have been found in other places to be excellent substitutes for parental care."

We have already exposed the fallacy contained in the first part of this extract: as to the latter, we would simply ask, what proper religious instruction is likely to be provided for these unfortunate beings who are to be imported "from the country and the colonies"? we mean in that rational and exalted view of the matter, of which, by the way, it is evident that the writers of the Prospectus have not even a glimpse—which would connect the philosophy of religion with all their other studies and attainments in knowledge? Already in imagination we hear some unhappy stripling exclaiming, like Andrew in "The Ordinary,"—

"Here's no proofs,
No doctrines, nor no uses. Tutor, I
Would fain learn some religion."

It seems that in the London University there will be very little either moral or intellectual discipline. As to moral, the case is plain enough: as to intellectual, the Prospectus states, "the number of the professors, the allotment of particular branches to individuals, and *the order in which the Lectures ought to be attended*, are matters not yet finally settled; and some of them must partly depend in the first instance on the *qualification of candidates*; others will permanently be regulated by *the demands for different sorts of instruction*." But Mr. Campbell is for "absolute liberty." He allows that "*indirect* modes might be found for influencing the general course of studies, without interfering with the absolute liberty of the student:" but just above he declares, "*it consists with the liberal principles of the present age, that the projected college should leave its students free to attend whatever classes, and in whatever succession they think fit*." Are then all the habits of mental discipline and self-government, of commanding the attention and fixing it upon studies which are the most highly valuable in their fruits, although at first irksome and of forbidding aspect, to be offered up upon the shrine of these "liberal principles of the age," and "the absolute liberty" of boys of fourteen? For our parts, we would rather trust to the discretion of a professor of education, who is thoroughly

acquainted with the sequence of ideas, and the natural development of the faculties, than to the choice of any tradesman in London, however respectable, or of any boy whatever—for we are not speaking of young men—even although his head had been duly felt and examined by Dr. Spurzheim or Mr. De Ville for that especial purpose. Let the father select the school or institution to which his son is to be sent; but let every school or institution have its own ascertained character and course of intellectual pursuits.

But then this freedom of choice seems required in an university; and the present establishment must be an University, for the greater glory of its projectors. And how is it to be converted into an University, in spite of the general age of the pupils, the absence of the power of conferring degrees, and certain other circumstances, which, in the opinion of Mr. Campbell, may be undeserving of mention? Why, in the first place, persons of all sorts and sizes are to be admissible: it is, says Mr. Campbell, “to be capable of instructing people as long as they wish to be instructed. And what says the Prospectus? “By the formation of an University in this metropolis, the useful intercourse of theory with active life will be facilitated; speculation will be instantly tried and corrected by practice; and the *man of business* will more readily find principles which will bestow simplicity and order on his experimental knowledge.” What! is the man of business to go to the London University? We really ask for information, as we profess an utter inability to see our way through all the mazes of the plan. Moreover, Mr. Campbell suggests, “in the evening there might be popular lectureships for *grown people, on the plan of other institutions.*” Are the ladies then to be edified in the evening at the London University, either by its own professors, or by occasional speculators, to whom the collegiate establishment is to be let, like the theatre of the Mechanics’ Institute, or the large room at the Crown and Anchor? Nothing less, we suppose, would “consist with the liberal principles of the present age.”

But there is another ingenious device for eking out an University. A College of Medicine is to be added: “the various branches of knowledge” are to be taught, “which are the objects of medical education:” and there are to be “clinical lectures, as soon as a *hospital* can be connected with this establishment.” Are there then no hospitals, and is there no medical education already in London?—or do the projectors conceive that in England a day-school and a hospital will make an University? Here is a place of education for boys and youths and adults—we had almost said for men, women, and children—without religious, or moral, or intellectual discipline;—a place where no rules seem to be accurately fixed, and no aim to be steadily preserved;—a place where,

in the wild attempt to embrace every thing at once, *general* education is mixed and confounded with *professional*. On one side we see a school-boy listening to a professor of languages: on the other, a young man sitting by the bedside of a patient in a hospital. And if the London University is to supersede Guy's Hospital and Bartholomew's Hospital, why does it not also affect to supplant the Temple and Lincoln's Inn, or to teach the minutiae of every trade and profession under the sun. The slightest reflection will show, that the case is by no means parallel to the military education at Woolwich and Sandhurst, or the clerical education which is, to a certain degree, connected with the usual studies at Oxford or Cambridge.

What too can be expected from a council composed of such discordant and heterogeneous materials? How can they ever amalgamate and "work together for good?" The members of the council are to look after the professors, and prevent them from teaching pernicious doctrines: but who is to look after the members of the council, and prevent them from making the establishment a seminary for the instilment of seditious or irreligious opinions. We want *permanent statutes*—known and settled regulations, on the basis of which the whole institution is to be conducted—not a temporary and fluctuating council, where the various individuals, as for instance the Duke of Norfolk and Mr. Mill, or Lord Dudley and Ward and Mr. Hume, cannot pull the same way; and where, in all human probability, the men of highest rank and stake in the country will be only the sleeping partners, glad to leave the real management of the concern to two or three bustling meddlers, who are eager to rise into notoriety and importance, or anxious to render the University an engine for the furtherance of their own private schemes. It may "consist with the liberal principles of the present age" to plant a learned and scientific institution upon the footing of a joint-stock company: it may consist with the same liberal principles to exhibit it, in its internal constitution, as a perfect republic or democracy; but we doubt very much whether it consists with the wisdom of parliament to bestow upon it the legal privileges which it asks, or extend to it any sanction.

For how is the legislature to know *what* it sanctions. What sufficient guarantee can be given by an establishment, of which the system is so latitudinarian and indefinite; and which, for aught that has yet appeared, may not be conducted in the same spirit to-morrow as to-day? The *only* certain and peculiar feature in the project is the prohibition of religious instruction.

But we must hasten to the conclusion of this protracted article. It has been our business from the commencement of it, not so much to examine any single Institution under all the aspects

which it might present itself, as to trace the same spirit running through many institutions and many plans; and thus far we have beheld the same actors playing nearly the same parts, upon somewhat different scenes.

Upon a survey of the whole system, we can have no hesitation in declaring our agreement with Mr. Rose, upon the main point, that the mechanical and physical sciences are pursued with an undue preference over the metaphysical, the moral, and the theological. The tendency of the system is to make us more and more an active, money-getting, utilitarian people: and, at best, to raise Franklins among us, according to the wish of Mr. Brougham; or men, acute, calculating, and industrious to the greatest degree, but deficient in those higher, more disinterested, and less worldly qualities, which have, after all, the greatest share in elevating the character of individuals, and promoting the true welfare of the human race. If, indeed, the actual condition of a country may be taken, as a test of its rank and station in intellectual improvement, it is quite evident from the excellence of our machinery and manufactures; the facility of loco-motion; and the perfection of the useful arts;—that those departments of knowledge, which contribute to the convenience, the comfort, and the ornament of animal life, have made the most rapid and gigantic strides in advance; but in the quantity of public crimes, and private vices; in the misery and disturbance caused by them in society; in that deficiency of loftiness of mind and moral self-command, which depend upon the power of virtue, for virtue also is power, we are far from perceiving a corresponding progress in ethics, or in religion. The same phenomena are observable in the political aspect of the times; for the spirit of politics and of education will naturally be alike, as the things themselves are reciprocally connected, and must act and re-act upon each other. In all which regards the wealth and commerce of the kingdom, new and more liberal regulations are adopted almost by acclamation; yet much carelessness is often manifested upon matters which more nearly concern its intrinsic strength, and its real prosperity and happiness.

With the general tenor, too, of Mr. Rose's argument, we cordially concur:—we believe with him, and Hume, and a multitude of antecedent writers, that moral science is of far more value and more dignity than physical; inasmuch as—to use the words of Locke—"the intellectual world is a larger and more beautiful world than the material;"—and the mind and soul of man are of superior importance to his body: we think him right, where he asserts, "it should be our earnest desire so to bestow our labour, and so to use the world, as to improve our being to the highest

pitch for its future destiny; and in comparison of this end, we should despise and condemn all immediate utility and present reward." We would also say, that at a period, when so much stress is laid upon the mechanical and economical sciences; when immediate utility and present reward are so steadily pursued, as the chief and primary objects of intellectual research; when, in short, *practical* education, as it is called, is all in all:—at such a period, we sincerely and heartily desire, that sound ethical and metaphysical learning may find a refuge and protection in our old and venerable universities:—that no paltry sarcasms may have the effect of discouraging the pursuit of polite and elegant literature, and more particularly of the classical poets and historians, those everlasting models of correctness and purity of taste;—that a stricter attention may be paid to pure, abstract, logical truths;—that the ultimate purposes and reflective efficacy of knowledge may be kept steadily in view;—and that the higher and more liberal, and—if the terms *practical* and *speculative* must be retained in a foolish opposition to each other—more *speculative* sciences, may find countenance and support in proportion to the neglect, which they too generally encounter among the modern legislators upon education; and in order to counteract this prevalent and pernicious spirit of the age.

Upon what points then, and in what degree, do we differ from Mr. Rose? We think that he has inadvertently pushed his sentiments too far; that he has suffered his zeal to outstrip his judgment, and has thus supplied fresh weapons and plausible ground of attack to the adversaries of the opinions which he advocates. We think, too, that he has manifested want of caution, by recommending, in more places than one, the improvement of our moral and intellectual being as the *only* legitimate object of human knowledge; by estranging philosophy from literature, and placing them in opposition; and by decrying the physical and experimental sciences, for the purpose of raising in our estimation the logical and the pure. This, in our opinion, is a serious mistake; there neither is, nor can be, any natural opposition between the objective and subjective sciences: nor can the interests of the one class be advanced or promoted by the discredit which is thrown upon the other. So far are they from being things which ought to be weighed in the balance each against each; or placed, like contending forces, in hostile array; that they afford mutual light and assistance, and should be taken together through every step of our intellectual training. In strict language indeed, our metaphysical knowledge can only be called into being by our observation of external nature: the phenomena of thought and consciousness must always have originally occurred to us in conjunc-

tion with objects presented to our senses. Without a perception of the material world, the very existence of such sciences as logic, or ethics, or the ontology of the schools, is absolutely inconceivable.

Again, our objective and subjective knowledge will often increase at the same time and in the same proportion. For instance, there is a severe and exact logic necessarily included in physico-mathematical inquiries. Could the investigations of Newton, or La Place, be pursued for a moment without developing and strengthening the higher faculties of the mind, as well as exercising the attention and the memory? And, if this truth be allowed by Mr. Rose with regard to mathematical sciences, how can he fairly dispute it with respect to the other regions in the vast empire of Physics,—to the discoveries, for example, of a Werner, a Lavoisier, a Davy, or a Watt?

Moreover, as the various departments of knowledge, although they are different, cannot be contradictory in their nature, so neither is there any real opposition in the ends for which they are pursued. One object may be beyond comparison higher than another;—but what is the utility, we would ask, of separating and contrasting them, when they may be, and ought to be, attained at once and by the same means? It is possible, we believe, to load the memory with physical facts, or chemical deductions, without any concomitant improvement of the logical powers of the understanding; but this misfortune, when it occurs, must wholly arise from a wretched method of instruction: with a decent proportion of care and skill on the part of the teacher, or the inquirer, the direct and reflective benefits of human study will be secured together. The proposition is, in fact, so evident, that to dispute it, after deliberating for a few moments, is to remain obstinately blind to a dispensation of Providence, wonderful alike in its mercy and in its wisdom. To prepare ourselves for a state of existence, which will last throughout eternity, is a matter of infinitely deeper and more awful concern, than to acquire temporal comfort and prosperity:—but the pursuits, by which man will make the nearest approximations to the perfections of his nature, and render himself a fitter recipient for an immortality of happiness, are the very means by which, in general cases, he will most effectually promote the secular welfare of himself and his fellow-creatures. The same harmony and accordance have been established by the goodness of God in intellectual speculation, as may be observed in practical conduct: and as many of the prophecies of holy writ were so propounded, as to have a primary and secondary accomplishment;—the one immediately discernible from outward events,—the other, silently advancing to its completion, and

ultimately to be manifested in the sight of men and angels; so every kind of learning may be so pursued, as directly to furnish us with a knowledge of phenomena in the material universe, and a consequent extension of our dominion over nature:—and, indirectly, to produce still nobler and more valuable consequences, by strengthening the intellect, refining the taste, and elevating the imagination. In a word, if we begin with ethical or logical studies, they can never receive their proper illustration without a reference to sensible objects; nor have their full use, without an application to physical purposes:—if we devote our thoughts to geological, or chemical, or mathematical pursuits, we must also attend to the subjective and logical truths connected with the philosophy of mind which are, as it were, evolved and brought out in the very process of our investigations.

There is yet another point which we would submit to the consideration of Mr. Rose. As man is a being made up of soul and body, of physical wants and moral capabilities, the departments of knowledge, which contribute to the health, the comfort, and the convenience of the animal frame, must form a large and indispensable part of human study, even for the sake of those nobler attributes of our nature, which are interwoven with the material and grosser particles. In individuals, the possession of immense wealth may be unfavourable to the improvement of the understanding and the morals, but abject poverty is incompatible with such amelioration. Among nations, those which are most oppressed by physical privations and necessities will be always found in the lowest state of moral and intellectual debasement. Wisdom and virtue have no enemy like want. The fact is equally proved by the history of the world, and every man's personal experience, or by reasonings *à priori* from the constitution of our being. It is worse than idle to oppose their united force; or to deny on the other hand, that when adequate provision has been made for the body, more time, more power, and more opportunities are created for the cultivation of the mind: and therefore that the advancement of medical, chemical, and economical science must be serviceable, upon a comprehensive view of men and things, to the interests of logical, ethical, and metaphysical learning. If it be true, that a slight corporeal ailment may derange the whole machine, and that the faculties of the mind, sublime and marvellous as they are, may suffer a temporary eclipse from a fit of indigestion; time cannot altogether be thrown away upon the “Hygiantics” of Mr. Bentham, or the *Gymnastics* of Captain Clias, and Professor Volkaer. But it must be considered on the other hand, that, beyond a certain point, as Mr. Mill has observed, “muscular strength is liable to operate unfavourably upon the

moral, as well as the intellectual, trains of thought; is apt to withdraw the owner from mental pursuits, and engage him in such as are more of the animal kind—the acquisition and display of physical powers.”

Mr. Rose seems to apprehend, that men will be so saturated with Mechanical and Chemical Philosophy, as to be unable to imbibe moral and religious knowledge: his opponents appear to think the latter kind of instruction of so little importance, as to be hardly worth the trouble of being instilled. The one party would disconnect logical from physical studies; the other would not lead physical up to metaphysical or logical. Mr. Rose is all for the reflective efficacy of science in elevating the character; the founders of Mechanics' Institutes lay the sole or principal stress upon its direct and visible effects in improving the condition. The latter look upon inductive and experimental investigations as the noblest employment of the human understanding; the former speak of empirical philosophy, almost like a German transcendentalist;—almost indeed in the spirit of Leibnitz, who was long inclined to reject the Newtonian theory of universal gravitation, because he had no arguments to prove it *à priori*. Mr. Rose describes that exertion as “*unmeaning*,” which has not some palpable bearing upon man's ultimate and immortal destiny; while the system of his adversaries has been apparently conceived in accordance with the principle which has been openly broached by some pretended philosophers upon the continent:—that the greatest mistake which moralists or legislators have ever committed, has been to mix up the individual capacity of man, as a moral or accountable being, with his social and political relations, and that the concerns of this world would go on infinitely better, and the state of its inhabitants be ameliorated in an incalculable degree, if the question of another were never taken into consideration for a moment. Here the utilitarian theory is nakedly avowed, and pushed to its full extent: and it is merely a partial conclusion from it, that an Established Church is an absurdity and a nuisance.

Thus it is, that extremes beget extremes, and that much of real knowledge is lost amid the excesses of contrary opinions. The systems are made to recede in a mutual and mistaken antipathy—as if repulsion were a more general law than attraction in the intellectual world—instead of being, as they might be, amalgamated, harmonized, and combined to the common benefit of both. Instead of being considered as sisters or allies, bound in an indissoluble knot,

“*Segnesque nodum solvere Gratiaë,*”

the different departments of study are now too often treated as competitors and rivals. Yet we might learn from the Scriptures that the glory of the sciences is in their union, for we are taught that wisdom is "one only manifold:" and that "there is time for every purpose and for every work."

For ourselves, we decry nothing: we would omit nothing. We believe, that both sides are right until they become exclusive. We do not reject *in toto* the theory of the utilitarian; but we think that utility is neither the *sole* principle to which human actions can be referred; nor the *sole* standard by which they should be tried. It is a joint and co-ordinate—not a single and supreme arbiter. We also think, that, *even upon the principle of utility*, moral and religious knowledge is the highest and truest of all wisdom. For upon this system, the measure of value by which knowledge is appreciated, is *not* the power, or wealth—for these are only inferior ends, or rather means, to the one ultimate end—but the happiness which it produces: and assuredly there is neither so much happiness caused by the possession, nor so much misery by the want, of any science whatever, as of that which regulates the passions and appetites—instils unfading contentment and sublime hope under the severest sorrows and privations—apportions our wishes to our capabilities—restrains the excesses, which are more fearful disturbing forces in the social world, than earthquakes and hurricanes in the material, and is necessary for every human being in every situation and at every moment of life. Yet, whatever be its comparative littleness or meanness, there is no art, and no department of intellectual research, which we wish to disparage, or which we can consider as in itself unworthy of attention.

It will be idle, therefore, to suppose of us, that we are enemies to mental activity in any of its legitimate pursuits. Our desire is, to equalize the balance of knowledge, not by detracting from one scale, but by throwing a greater weight into its opposite. Our hope and trust is, that the tide of intellectual improvement may be never destined to have an ebb. We do not ask, that the machine of science should be stopped; but that some new springs should be added, and the rest adjusted in better harmony and proportion; in order that the action of the whole may be surer and more beneficial. Would we arrest the mechanic, or the mechanic's child, as he is beginning to run the race of knowledge, as he is striving to pass within the threshold of philosophy? Would we repulse him, as he presses forward to the goal: and debar him from quenching his thirst at the living waters of scientific truth?—Our habits, our feelings, and our prepossessions run the other way. But we do wish, that mechanical science may

never constitute all, or the larger part, of the instruction, which is bestowed upon English artizans. We do wish, that their Institutes may be conducted in a quiet, rational, and unassuming spirit; and we entertain the wish less for the sake of the higher classes than of the workmen themselves. Upon the design of rendering science practical, and practice scientific, we have already bestowed the tribute of our applause; but we cannot forget, that there are other and higher objects more important by far, both to states and individuals, for the loss of which the utmost perfection of theoretical attainments and actual skill would be a most sorry and insignificant compensation.

As to the foundation of a new University, if there be need of such an establishment, let it be founded, and let it prosper! We feel, that to a sanguine and philanthropic mind the project recommends itself at once; and possesses attractions, which it might require in any case some effort of the reason to resist. Opposition to it, on the other hand, can hardly fail to carry some semblance at first sight of paltry jealousy, or illiberal and narrow conceptions.—Yet we shall not be deterred from stating our assurance, that the University now in progress has been undertaken upon views rather loose and ambitious, than comprehensive and profound: or from declaring our sincere belief, that it would be unwise for Parliament to confer upon it any legal privileges which can be constitutionally withheld;—until the Directors shall have reconsidered their Prospectus;—until they shall have come forward with a more matured scheme, and less unphilosophical arrangements;—and until they have recognized the truth of the proposition, “Education, unless grounded upon religious principles, may be a curse instead of a blessing. Education, with religion, is the greatest good, which man can bestow on man.”

ART. XIV.—*Pastoral Watchfulness and Zeal: particularly in Personal Instruction and Admonition. Recommended in Two Sermons preached at the Bishop's Visitation at Abingdon, August 21, 1826, and August 30, 1814, by the Rev. Edward Berens, M.A., Vicar of Shoreham, Berks. Rivingtons, London. Parker, Oxford. 1s.*

WE have derived so much pleasure from the former publications of Mr. Berens, that we perused the two discourses now before us with a strong prepossession in his favour; and we have not been disappointed. The same simple, unpretending style, the

same modest yet decided tone that ran through his other volumes, is still employed.

We quote the following passage as a specimen of the feeling and impressive manner in which Mr. Berens urges one the most important duties of the clergy: and it is only in the hope that these excellent discourses may be more universally known than visitation sermons usually are, that we abstain from extracting a larger portion of them.

"We are to take heed unto *all* the flock. No individual in a parish is to be considered as beneath or as beyond our pastoral care. If our public ministrations are well attended, and successful in turning many to righteousness, there is proportionably the less need of private exertion. Many, however, of those who are present at our sermons, are slow in deriving any real and permanent benefit from them; and many neglect them altogether. What shall we then do?—Shall we say of such men, that the Church is open to them, and that if they obstinately refuse to attend the public instruction of the Church, it is their own fault, their blood be upon their own heads? Oh, no. None of us, I am sure, can deem so lightly of those endless sufferings, the intermination of which forms so painful but sometimes so necessary a part of our pastoral addresses. We *must* not—we *can* not so leave them to perish. Their absenting themselves from the public ordinances of religion is an additional proof how urgently they need to be admonished, and warned to flee from the wrath to come. We must,—at least when the largeness of a parish does not preclude attention to individuals—we *must* follow them to their homes; and guided by ministerial zeal and Christian prudence, must seek and watch for opportunities of awakening them from their spiritual lethargy, and of exciting them to think seriously of the salvation of their souls." (p. 21.) Again,

"I acknowledge that it is with the deepest self-abasement that I reflect on the pledge I gave, and think how imperfectly I have redeemed it. Whenever the solemn and peculiar toll of the bell tells me that one of my parishioners has been summoned to his last account, the sound comes over me accompanied by a feeling of my own responsibility; and when informed who the departed person is, and again when the body is finally laid in the grave, I am generally led to reflect—too often to reflect painfully—whether I have done all that I reasonably might have done for his spiritual welfare,—to think what *could have been done more for that man's salvation that I have not done for it.*" (p. 24.)

ART. XV.—*The Office of the Christian Teacher, considered: in a Sermon preached August 23, 1826, in St. Giles's Church, Reading, at the Primary Visitation of the Lord Bishop of Salisbury; and printed at the request of his Lordship and the Clergy.* By the Rev. H. H. Milman, Vicar of St. Mary, Reading. 2s. 6d. Murray, London. Parker, Oxford. 1826.

IN this eloquent discourse Mr. Milman considers the manner of preaching which Christian ministers ought to adopt.—“The human soul,” he observes, “is accessible through three principal faculties, the Imagination, the Reason, and the Passions or Affections.”—And his object is to show, that if any of these approaches be neglected, or be exclusively or unduly frequented, great mischief must ensue. His description of the effects produced in the Church of Rome by too frequent appeals to the imagination, will convey some idea to our readers of the vigour and warmth with which his task is executed.

“The religion of the dark ages, to almost the whole of which the Roman Catholic church adheres with blind and unwise pertinacity, was addressed exclusively to the imagination, and found its way through the imagination alone to the feelings. If this system was formed and perfected in misjudging compliance with the state of the human mind, candour as well as charity will acknowledge, that the motive for its original adoption may have been pious and Christian. The progress of barbarism and the progress of Roman Catholic doctrines were simultaneous. For in the barbarian, as in the child, the imagination is the most active and easily excited faculty, the reason is dormant. The Christian therefore was taught by symbolic representation rather than argument, and the prophetic office delegated to the outward ceremony and significant rite. Thus the imagination being the only channel by which religious knowledge could easily be conveyed, its task was facilitated by all practicable means; every thing was as far as possible brought down to the comprehension of the senses, and the conceptions of the imagination assisted by embodying, as it were, the truths of religion in the painting and the statue. The whole of the evangelic history, to say nothing of the monstrous and incoherent legends which were engrafted upon it, all the facts of Christianity were made graphic and visible: the life of Christ was told by pictures of his miracles, his death preached by the crucifix. Wherever oral teaching was attempted, the preacher held the Cross in his hand, and exemplified and enforced the truth of its arguments by pointing to the wounds, and appealing to the bleeding image. That however which began in pious condescension to the weakness of man, ended in confirming that weakness, and substituting a superstition almost heathen for the spiritual doctrine of Christianity. That which was first adopted to enforce the higher articles of the creed on an ignorant and unreasoning people, became itself the creed. The ritual;

which was intended to preach by lively representations, hallowed its forms and images, as if they were an integral and essential part of the religion. All those doctrines which were subsequently abused by the fraud, or retained by the blindness of ecclesiastical tyranny, grew up gradually out of this system of teaching. Not only the worship of images, of saints and angels, with that of the Virgin, but unquestionably transubstantiation itself, and the sacrifice of the mass, may be deduced from the increasing desire of governing the public mind through the imagination. The symbol was transformed into the God, by precisely the same process that the pagan idol, which represented the attributes of some immaterial and beneficent being, became the actual adored and dreaded divinity. Hence throughout Christendom, instead of gazing with awful horror and devout humility upon the secrets of the immaterial world, the whole was familiarized, and with daring, though unintentional profanation, exhibited in distinct and vivid lineaments. The celestial hierarchy of heaven was disciplined and marshalled into ranks and orders; each angel had his office and function. Hell was laid open with equal presumption; and to complete the system, the more accessible region of purgatory gained an easy belief. A perpetual intercourse took place between this world and the next; every thing which occurred within this nearer place of probation was under the direct cognizance of the priesthood. Souls returned in visible forms, or at least with audible voices, to demand the masses which were to shorten their purgation, or to bear witness to their efficacy in expediting the work of final salvation. Even the heaven of heavens was not secure against the profane invasion; the Immaterial, the Incomprehensible, He, whom no one but the Son hath seen, was embodied. The Trinity itself assumed form and substance, the ineffable union was described, not in words only, but in forms and colours; and represented under whatever symbols appeared most appropriate."—pp. 21—24.

Mr. Milman intimates the possibility of attempting hereafter a more full development of the theory here suggested.—We shall rejoice at the fulfilment of his intention; but venture at the same time to suggest, that it should be preceded by a more careful examination of that part of the subject which relates to the imagination; and that his remarks respecting the "dry and scholastic manner," which prevailed in England during the last century, should be supported, if they can be supported, by a reference to facts.—We have often met with similar observations; but have never been so fortunate as to hear them substantiated. We entirely agree with Mr. Milman in the following description of what a sermon ought to be; and all we desire to know is, the names of those writers who are or were in good repute in the Church of England, and who transgressed against these rules.

"The result of the discussion appears to be this, that while it is dangerous to assign to either faculty an excessive or disproportionate share,

it is equally perilous to the successful propagation of religion to omit either. If the dangers attending a predominant attention to the excitement of the imagination and the feelings, without at the same time enlightening the reason, are more evident and appalling, it is because superstition and fanaticism are more obtrusive, more direct and immediate in their evil consequences, than the deadly lethargy of inoperative religion. It is a fearful infringement on the rights of Omnipotence to add the imaginative inventions of men to the pure and simple worship which he has commanded; it is still more so, to supersede the meek and humble spirit of Christianity with the exultations of spiritual pride, the phrensy of bodily excitation, the morose and gloomy temper of the fanatic. But we must not forget, on the other hand, that even the reason must be watched with jealous vigilance. We may argue about religion without being ourselves religious, or making others so. A people *may draw near with their lips*: but that is not all; they must *draw near with their hearts also*. Look to the cold and barren creed of the Socinian; look to the daring spirit of the rationalizing divines of modern Germany, who resolve all the miracles of our Lord into physical facts; and dread the pride of reason as much as the extravagance of the dreaming quietist, or the hallucinations of the frantic enthusiast. God has given to man these faculties of the soul as the inestimable distinctions of his nature: they are at once the pledges and the testimonies of his immortality; neither therefore must refuse its homage, neither decline the invaluable privilege of assisting in the great work of inculcating and enforcing Christian truth."—p. 27.

ART. XVI.—*Thoughts on the Erection of a Chapel of Ease in the parish of Whitwick, addressed to the Inhabitants of that Parish, and particularly to those of the Townships of Thringstone and Swannington.* By the Rev. Francis Merewether, M. A. Vicar of the Parish. 12mo. pp. 45. 3d. Leicester. 1826.

THE spirit in which this letter is written may be perceived from the following extracts:

"Every occasion that serves to remind me of my dear and sacred connexion with you, I consider interesting and important. And if one more momentous than another can possibly arise, it surely must be that of having obtained increased facilities towards joining in the worship of that Church, of which I am a minister. On the approach of such an event, I should blame myself if I did not address to you, in some way or other, the words of affectionate exhortation and counsel. At the same time, since the *numbers* and *extent* of this parish render it difficult to confer with you all in person on this subject; whilst I am likewise anxious that you should be in possession of my sentiments upon it in a *durable* shape; I have adopted the present mode of addressing you, as

the best I can think of, for answering my views and purpose. And as the remarks I am now about to offer to you arise, as I earnestly hope and believe, from a feeling which *ought* to be uppermost in my mind, viz. a wish for your souls' good; so I hope you will accept them as such, and read the observations now addressed to you, with "*a meek and quiet* (and teachable) *spirit*."—p. 4.

"I would ask you:—Does the neglect of the Clergy *now*, or does it not, justify your *present* separation? It will be remembered, that I am now addressing the inhabitants of *my own Parish alone*: consequently, am not called to say any thing respecting my brethren of the Parochial Clergy, whose learning, piety, and professional diligence and faithfulness, (qualifications in which, I believe, the English Clergy are not to be surpassed by those of any Church in Christendom whatsoever,) are far above my vindication and praise. The question, therefore in the present instance, assumes a strictly personal character; and as such, I am not at all disposed to shrink from it. In the sight of God, therefore, and within the sanctuary of your own breasts, I appeal to you solemnly, and ask, whether, either as respects myself, or my valuable and useful curate, you can, in either case, lay neglect to our charge? I will ask farther, can you allege against either or both of us, that we have systematically failed in our endeavours of "*rightly dividing the word of truth*?" that we have "*handled the word of God deceitfully*?" or dealt it forth to our people in unfair or unscriptural proportions? Have we recommended *faith* to the disparagement of *works*? or exhorted to *works*, at the expense of *Christian faith*? Have we so *exalted the grace of God*, as to *discountenance human exertions*? or have we so *elevated the labours of men*, as to *keep out of sight the paramount necessity of Divine aid*, to go before and along with human endeavours? On one doctrine indeed, which forms the other ground of your separation, *we* and *you* are at issue; but it remains to be shown, on which side Scripture authority lies; and this I shall have to consider presently. Without a single exception, can you bring against us any accusation of *concealing or misrepresenting* any Christian doctrine or precept, which, happily, I believe we hold in common? And if you cannot, where, I will ask you in conclusion of this head, where, as far as the ministrations of the clergy are concerned, is your plea for present separation? Especially, too, when the judicious language of our Church, already partially quoted, is added; to which I think you can bring no valid objection; viz. that 'although in the visible Church sometimes the evil have chief authority in the ministration of the Word and Sacraments; yet, forasmuch as they do not the same in their own name, but in Christ's, and do minister by his commission and authority, we may use their ministry, both in hearing the Word of God, and in receiving of the Sacraments.'"—pp. 15—18.

The effect of this manly and Christian appeal must be advantageous. If it does not diminish the sectarianism which exists in Mr. Merewether's parish, it will prove that the separation is groundless; it will either put an end to a grievous scandal, or remove the burden of it from the Church to the Conventicle.

ART. XVII. *A Sermon preached in the Cathedral Church of St. Paul, on Thursday, May 19, 1825, at the Festival of the Sons of the Clergy.* By the Very Rev. James Henry Monk, D.D. Dean of Peterborough. 4to. pp. 44. 1s. 6d. London, Rivingtons. 1826.

FROM the discourse of this very able and zealous preacher, we extract two passages, with which our readers ought to be acquainted. The first contains a valuable suggestion, which we trust that the friends of the Church will not overlook. The second is a powerful description of a melancholy but important fact.

“ In stating the difficulties to which a large portion of our clerical brethren are necessarily exposed, we must not omit the serious deficiency existing in too many parishes, from the want of suitable dwellings for their ministers. Numerous are the cases where there is to be found on a living no residence house whatever; or such an one as can barely afford shelter for the family of a day labourer. To remedy this evil, by building mansions for incumbents, at the expense of their preferment, a wise and excellent law has been enacted: the provisions of which have proved extensively beneficial in procuring habitations for the residence of the pastor in the bosom of his flock. But to that poorer class of benefices, to which the foregoing remarks principally refer, this enactment of the legislature is scarcely ever applicable. Unless, therefore, some extraneous aid shall interpose, those parishes must still be left without a residence appropriated to their ministers; and all the benefit which results from the abode of an enlightened individual in the midst of the people to whose welfare he is devoted, as a parent to that of his children, must be lost. The want of a habitation in the place where his spiritual duties are allotted, is to the minister an evil of considerable magnitude: but to the community, and to the interests of religion, the injury is far more severe. To secure to every parish in the kingdom a resident minister, no enactments will, I apprehend, be found effectual, until a provision be made for the erection and upholding of Glebe Houses wherever they are wanting. And for such a measure, so essential to the public welfare, as well as to the maintenance of our Apostolical religion, we must look to the public liberality and spirit of this mighty nation. I am well aware how great is the presumption of an humble individual, who ventures to suggest and recommend a plan which can only be realized by the authority and the munificence of the Legislature. But in consideration of the duty this day committed to me, I may, perhaps, be pardoned if, while treating of the causes which lead to the depression of our order and the prejudice of Christ's Church, I have adverted to measures whereby an evil of great and crying importance might be remedied. At least I must be allowed to offer a humble prayer, that the Almighty may dispose the hearts of our rulers to take the case into their full consideration. Then might we entertain a hope that the present season

of tranquillity and prosperity, with which it has pleased Heaven to bless our country, will not be suffered to pass away without an extension of the public aid to accomplish so desirable a measure. To devote a small portion of the increased resources of the empire in serving the cause of piety and charity, will mark our gratitude for the blessings now vouchsafed to our people, and will moreover give us a better title to hope for their continuance."—p. 13.

"The last topic to which I have alluded, is one of a painful import, and such as it would be far more agreeable to my feelings, upon a day consecrated to the cause of Christian charity, to pass over in silence. But in speaking of matters affecting the interests of our Apostolical Church, it is impossible to banish from the mind the hardships and the dangers with which it is at this period encompassed. It is but too well known, that for sometime past, a design has been systematically pursued by various persons, and in different parts of the country, of vilifying and decrying all religion, and particularly of attacking the ecclesiastical Establishment of this land. Respecting the quarter in which these persecuting hostilities against our Church originated, there can be little doubt or uncertainty. They have proceeded from certain public writers; with whom, however, it seems to have been but a secondary object to defame the established Priesthood: this formed only part of a more extensive scheme for producing disaffection to our civil and ecclesiastical constitution. It will be remembered that a very few years ago, when the efforts of these writers were aided by a temporary distress, occasioning discontent in some parts of the community, their progress became alarming to every lover of social order. The political innovators, whose schemes are here alluded to, accompanied them by incessant attacks upon that holy religion, the principles of which they found irreconcilably opposed to their proceedings: and taking advantage of the general diffusion of education among the people, they propagated the poisonous lessons of infidelity, to an extent which the mind cannot contemplate without a feeling of horror. Well aware how impossible it was to excite men to schemes of anarchy and plunder, so long as religion retained its influence over their minds, they began by exhorting them to reject the Christian dispensation as founded in imposture, and by reviling the sacred word of God. It was about this time, and in furtherance of such purposes, that resort was had to the measure of assailing the Ministers of our Church, by every species of misrepresentation, slander, and invective. The real object of these attacks, being confined to publications which are otherwise labouring to propagate unbelief and contempt for religion, is too clear and palpable to require a moment's comment."—p. 19.

"Too many are at all times ready to listen to any report disparaging to men, whose functions invest them with a peculiar title to respect. This unhappy propensity of our nature must have been calculated upon by those writers, who represent the Clergy as hard hearted and rapacious in the exaction of their dues; who search after every instance of misconduct in a Divine, from times past as well as present, and then,

with unconceivable unfairness, advance it as a reflection upon a whole order, the great majority of whom are irreproachable ; and who, finally, represent the riches possessed by the Church of England as enormous in amount ; and by styling them a tax upon the community, excite the cupidity of the multitude to such schemes of spoliation as might destroy the very existence of the Establishment.

"From the last complaint against the Church, little impression can be expected beyond that which a falsehood, confidently asserted, generally produces at the moment. It has led to a strict investigation of the fact, and the result has not only exposed those shameless exaggerations, but has shown that the total endowment of the Clergy is far from exceeding such a moderate provision, as their numbers, and the station in society which they are expected to maintain, render fitting and necessary."—p. xxi.

ART. XVII.—1. *A Farewell Sermon, preached in the Parish Church of Hodnet, in the County of Salop, April 20, 1823.* By the Rev. Reginald Heber, D.D. Bishop of Calcutta. 8vo. 1s. 6d. Shrewsbury. 1826.

2. *The Omnipresence of God.—A Sermon preached Aug. 5, 1825, on the Consecration of the Church of Secrole, near Benares.* By Reginald, Lord Bishop of Calcutta. 1s. 6d. London, Hatchard and Son. 1826.

3. *The Blessedness of the faithful and wise Steward.—A Funeral Sermon, preached in St. John's Church, Trichinopoly, April 9, 1826, on the Decease of the Right Rev. Reginald, Lord Bishop of Calcutta.* By the Rev. Thomas Robinson, M.A. Domestic Chaplain to his Lordship. 8vo. 1s. 6d. London, Rivingtons. 1826.

4. *A Sermon, preached in the Cathedral Church of St. John, in Calcutta, on Sunday, April 23, 1826, on occasion of the Death of the Right Rev. Reginald, Lord Bishop of Calcutta.* By the Rev. Daniel Corrie, LL.B. Archdeacon of Calcutta. 8vo. 1s. London. 1826.

IN offering these detached pieces to the attention of our readers, it may be proper for us to state, that although we have not heretofore found it consistent with our plan to take notice of single sermons, we hope in future to be able to do so. Of course it is only a summary view that we can afford, excepting on very special occasions, amongst which, this will be readily considered as one ; for the name of Reginald Heber brings with it so many interesting associations and recollections to all who knew him, that it is impossible to treat it as a common theme :

and on the other hand, it is a name so intimately connected, in the public mind, with every thing pious, enlightened, and benevolent, as to exclude all fear that the indulgence of our own feelings will incur reproach.

Of the four sermons placed at the head of this article, the two former were preached by himself, on particular occasions connected with his later life, and the latter, in honour of his memory, by clergymen in India, whose opportunities of knowing him were as ample as their intelligence and integrity are undoubted.

It is with a view to the same object, and in the hope of making his episcopal life more known to his countrymen in England, rather than for the sake of any critical analysis, that we have brought these discourses together; believing that, as far as they go, they will be effectual for the purpose we have in view, and are calculated to throw light upon each other. The former present to us, partially indeed, the character of his mind, as impressed upon his own thoughts and opinions, which occur there; the latter more fully, as it was presented in active life, and viewed and estimated by others; and as he was certainly one of the most natural and unaffected men alive, there is no danger of our being misled by them. Nor must this inquiry be regarded as the mere impulse of personal feeling, offering a vain homage to the dead; for, besides the benefit which we derive from the contemplation of departed worth, in every department of life, (and where shall we find an instance more pregnant with such benefit than this?) there is a high importance attached to the office he lately bore, and to his manner of discharging it, which recommends forcibly this portion of his history to all who are or may be connected with the promotion of Christian knowledge in the same field. It is here that future ministers, of every description, may derive a salutary lesson for their own conduct and guidance, in their difficult and delicate task; for whatever lustre the genius and acquirements of Bishop Heber may have thrown around him, wherever he took his way, we may be certain that he would never have united the suffrages of intelligent men in every class in India, as he did, (of which each new arrival brings us fresh testimony,) if the plain and direct course of his ministry had not been such as sound policy would dictate and experience had approved.

Before, however, we apply ourselves to the topics suggested by these documents, we are desirous of offering one or two observations upon the motives of a choice which has thus eventually deprived Christianity of one of its best and warmest friends, and cast a gloom, not only over his own family, but over our whole literary and Christian world.

When Dr. Heber's acceptance of the Bishopric of Calcutta was finally announced to his friends, the intelligence was received with surprise by all, and with deep regret by many, whose personal feelings were too powerful to be altogether excluded from the question. They saw that a bright career was opened for him at home, combining great usefulness with equal honour, upon which this step would inevitably close the door: and this regret was aggravated to some by the belief, that there were certain points of his character, which, however amiable in themselves, were calculated to prevent that eminent degree of success, which could alone atone for the sacrifice he was to make, and the hazard he was to encounter. It was thought that the simplicity of his taste and manners would be ill suited to a country, where the current of men's minds, running almost uniformly to the acquisition of wealth, naturally attached to pomp and show, and every other mark and symbol of that idol, a degree of importance beyond what they obtain in Europe. And it was farther argued that, notwithstanding all that Dr. Heber had seen and read of human life, there was a prodigality of kindness and confidence in his nature, which must frequently embarrass him in the discharge of an office, where so many conflicting interests would press upon him with their claims, and so many minds of different characters and views were to be studied, conciliated and directed in one channel. That these fears were vain, experience has proved; and, in justice to the memory of the Bishop, we must affirm that no misgiving of this kind ever occurred to himself. A struggle he had, as his friends are well aware, but maintained upon different ground, and, though sharp, decisive. He knew, and had weighed well the various difficulties with which Christianity had to contend in India, and modest and humble as he was, he had studied, anxiously, the quality and bent of his own resources with regard to them. The more he thought of the matter in this light, the more he was convinced that India was the proper field of his Christian labours; and having come to this conclusion, he was determined that no sense of present ease, nor hope of future splendour, should interfere with a conviction, which he regarded as the voice of Heaven speaking to him through his conscience.

"The die is cast, after an anxious and painful deliberation," said one, at that time intimately acquainted with his thoughts; "he cannot refuse to exercise the talents committed to his charge, for God's service, in a field so clearly pointed out to him, and, as his motives for taking it have been of the purest and most conscientious kind, so I trust that God's grace will be poured out upon his exertions, and that this step may not only be pro-

ductive of blessings to many, but may be for his own welfare both here and hereafter."

To cross upon such views as these with advice would have been an offence like that of Peter; Be it far from thee, Lord. And now lamenting bitterly, as we may, his irreparable loss, who can look back upon the bright and benevolent career he ran in India, without acknowledging that this reasoning was amply justified? Who can reflect upon the good he crowded into the brief period of his ministry, the judicious plans he devised and entered upon, the deep and edifying interest he excited through every part of that vast empire; the impulse given by him to the cause of Christianity; the light and grace he has shed upon the Establishment itself; the holy labours amidst which he died, and the prayers and blessings which have followed him, without feeling that the wish of his kind friend has been accomplished; "that the grace of heaven has indeed been poured upon his exertions; that they have been productive of blessings to many; and (shall we hesitate to say?) have added to his own welfare both here and hereafter."

But this theme would carry us too far. It is pleasing, however, to state, from the documents before us, that the simplicity of his mind, contrasted with the variety of his attainments, and regarded with a view to his office, seems to have been the most attractive feature of his character in India; and as for the moral influence he attained and directed, his success, notwithstanding some little difficulties at the first, was so complete as to illustrate a fact of great importance in life; that high qualities are the best means for carrying high purposes into effect, and especially that an enlightened zeal in the cause of Christianity will so certainly carry with it the good wishes and co-operation of the better part of our nature, as to be an ample compensation for the want of that aid, which a deeper knowledge of the selfish views and little passions of others might obtain.

Before we leave this subject, it may be right to correct a very natural mistake into which some of his Indian friends (Mr. Robinson and Sir Charles Grey) have fallen, and which is only of consequence as it affects the character of the sacrifice he made in going out there; viz. that on his return from abroad, he had retired to a country village, where, as Sir Charles Grey expresses it, he had buried in his heart those talents that might have ministered to his vanity in the world, to produce a richer harvest. The truth is, that the Rectory of Hodnet, where he resided, was a family living of great value, (3000*l.* a year,) comprising the estate of his ancestors; several chapelries, of which Hawkstone, the celebrated seat of the Hills, was one; situated in a fine

country; surrounded by an excellent neighbourhood, of which he was indeed the delight and the ornament; and where he frequently conversed with men, who could appreciate and even stimulate his talents.

It was from this place, where he resided almost wholly to the last, and where his mother and sister were settled, and not from Lincoln's Inn, where he resided only a short period of the year, that he was reluctantly called to this appointment. It was here were fixed those ties which it cost him so much to break when he went to India, and it was here he must have been seen and known, to understand the value of the sacrifice he made. It is true, indeed, that he was even then cultivating his talents for a richer harvest. In the enjoyment of society his life was ever studious and contemplative—much of every day was sedulously dedicated to books and to parochial duties; and when he paid his distant visits, he generally went on foot—on which occasions, if you happened to cross upon his path, or greet him on his arrival, you would perceive at once, that he had been conversant with higher thoughts than those which the road presented to him.

We will now pass on to the documents before us. The first is a farewell sermon, delivered upon the eve of his departure for India, to his parishioners at Hodnet, who, having listened to it with many tears, under the hasty but prophetic impression caused by the distance about to separate them, that they should see his face no more, had earnestly entreated to retain amongst them this last lesson of love, (for such indeed it was,) as a memorial of a Pastor, whose character, if they could not wholly appreciate, they knew at least enough of to admire and love. This sermon was printed at Shrewsbury, expressly for his parishioners, and is little known beyond the place where it was preached. It is a warm and unstudied effusion from his pen, very affecting to them at the time, and now interesting to all on several accounts; for while it describes to us incidentally, the character of his intercourse with his parish, it offers many pleasing proofs of the charity and humility which were the leading features of his mind, and of which he left strong traces wherever he went. "Dearly beloved, I beseech you, as strangers and pilgrims, abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul."—1 Peter, ii. 11. In illustrating the Apostle's view, when he addressed his converts as strangers and pilgrims, the following pleasing illustration of life occurs.

"Life bears us on like the stream of a mighty river. Our boat, at first, glides gently down the narrow channel, through the playful murmurings of the little brook, and the windings of its grassy border. The trees shed their blossoms over our young heads; the flowers on the

brink seem to offer themselves to our young hands ; we are happy in hope, and we grasp eagerly at the beauties around us ; but the stream hurries us on, and still our hands are empty.

“ Our course in youth and manhood is along a wider and deeper flood, and amid objects more striking and magnificent. We are animated by the moving picture of enjoyment and industry which passes before us, we are excited by some short-lived success, or depressed and rendered miserable by some equally short-lived disappointment. But our energy and our dependence are both in vain. The stream bears us on, and our joys and our griefs alike are left behind us ; we may be shipwrecked but we cannot anchor ; our voyage may be hastened but it cannot be delayed ; whether rough or smooth, the river hastens towards its home, till the roaring of the ocean is in our ears, and the tossing of his waves is beneath our keel, and the lands lessen from our eyes, and the floods are lifted up around us, and the earth loses sight of us, and we take our last leave of earth and its inhabitants, and of our further voyage there is no witness but the Infinite and Eternal !

“ And do we still take so much anxious thought for the future days, when the days which are gone by have so strangely and uniformly deceived us ? Can we still so set our hearts on the creatures of God, when we find, by sad experience, that the Creator only is permanent ? Or shall we not rather lay aside every weight and every sin which does most easily beset us, and think of ourselves henceforth as wayfaring persons only, who have no abiding inheritance but in the hope of a better world, and to whom even that world would be worse than hopeless, if it were not for our Lord Jesus Christ, and the interest which we have obtained in his mercies ?”—p. 9—11.

He then proceeds to an application which is personal to themselves.

“ But if such are the considerations which (taken as a general truth, and stated in general language) the uncertainty of mortal life is always calculated to awaken in us, more especially have thoughts of this nature been called up in my mind by the near approach of that time when my ministerial labours among you must have an end ; when I must give over, into other hands, the task of watching over your spiritual welfare, and when many, very many, of those with whom I have grown up from childhood, in whose society I have passed my happiest days, and to whom it has been, during more than fifteen years, my duty and my delight (with such ability as God has given me) to preach the Gospel of Christ, must, in all probability, see my face in the flesh no more.

“ Under such circumstances, and connected with many who now hear me by the dearest ties of blood, of friendship, and of gratitude, some mixture of regret is excusable, some degree of sorrow is holy. I cannot, without some anxiety for the future, forsake, for an untried and arduous field of duty, the quiet scenes where, during so much of my past life, I have enjoyed a more than usual share of earthly comfort and prosperity. I cannot bid adieu to those with whose idea almost every recollection of past happiness is connected, without many earnest wishes for their wel-

fare, and (I will confess it) without some severe self-reproach, that, while it was in my power, I have done so much less than I ought to have done to render that welfare eternal.

“There are, indeed, those here who know, and there is One above all who knows better than any of you, how earnestly I have desired the peace and holiness of his church: how truly I have loved the people of this place; and how warmly I have hoped to be a means in his hands of bringing many among you to glory. But I am at this moment but too painfully sensible that, in many things, yea in all, my performance has fallen short of my principles; that neither privately nor publicly have I taught you with so much diligence as now seems necessary in my eyes—nor has my example set forth the doctrines in which I have, however imperfectly, instructed you. Yet, if my zeal has failed in steadiness, it has never been wanting in sincerity. I have expressed no conviction which I have not deeply felt; have preached no doctrine which I have not steadfastly believed: however inconsistent my life, its leading object has been your welfare, and I have hoped and sorrowed, and studied and prayed for your instruction, and that you might be saved. For my labours, such as they were, I have been, indeed, most richly rewarded, in the uniform affection and respect which I have received from my parishioners; in their regular and increasing attendance in this holy place and at the table of the Lord; in the welcome which I have never failed to meet in the houses both of rich and of poor; in the regret (beyond my deserts and beyond my fullest expectations) with which my announced departure has been received by you; in your expressed and repeated wishes for my welfare, and my return; in your numerous attendance on the present occasion, and in those marks of emotion which I now witness around me, and in which I am myself well nigh constrained to join.

“For all these accept such thanks as I can pay: accept my best wishes: accept my affectionate regret: accept the continuance of those prayers which I have hitherto offered up for you daily, and in which, whatever and wherever my sphere of duty may hereafter be, my congregation of *HODNET* shall (believe it!) never be forgotten. But accept, above all, as the best legacy which I can leave behind me, a few plain words of advice, such as are suggested by my text and by the circumstances under which I now address you; and such as, if duly borne in mind by each of us, will strip our separation of its most painful features, and secure to us, if our faith is true, a more blessed meeting hereafter.”—pp. 12—15.

Then follows his last paternal advice, in which, alluding to some little animosity which probably existed in the parish, he says,

“Would to God, indeed, that I could hope to leave you all as truly at peace with each other, as, I trust and believe, there is peace between myself and you! Yet, if there be any here whom I have at any time offended, let me entreat his forgiveness, and express the hope that he has already forgiven me. If any who thinks he has done me wrong (I know of none,) let him be assured that the fault, if it were one, is not only forgiven but forgotten. And let me earnestly entreat you all, as it may be the last

request which I shall ever make, the last advice which I shall ever offer to you—Little children, love one another, and forgive one another, even as God, for Christ's sake, hath loved and forgiven you!"—(p. 17.)

When we consider who and what this man was, how praised and distinguished in early life above his fellows; how beloved, admired and esteemed in his maturer years; how high at that very moment in station and in public opinion, and then think of him thus unaffectedly imploring the pardon of the simple farmers and labourers around him, and beseeching their prayers in expressions, not to expire upon the lip, but to be preserved and recorded: it would be difficult to find a more affecting or more genuine picture of humility. Nor can we wonder at the impression left by it in India. Indeed, it was the constant habit of his mind—so meekly did he bear his faculties, and so easily did this grace sit upon him, as to impress upon every one the notion of its being natural; but it is more likely that the same early study of the Bible, which furnished the rich materials for his Palestine, had supplied also the charm which preserved the lowliness of his mind amidst so many trials and temptations calculated to mislead and to inflate it. At all events, we are sure that it was from this source he derived the support of it in his future life. It is not to be imagined, for a moment, that he was insensible to those gifts and graces which Providence had bestowed upon him. This would have rendered him less grateful, and less useful too: *qui se nescit, nescit se uti*; but he knew, that such as he was, he was by the grace of God; and he felt that as his best faculties were derived from, so also should they be dedicated to, that Almighty Power, in the view of whose infinite wisdom, it is not the number of the talents, but the manner of using them, which makes the difference.

Dr. Heber was consecrated Bishop of Calcutta, at Lambeth; not many weeks after this sermon was preached; embarked for his diocese in June, 1823; and arrived there on October 3d of the same year.

After spending a proper time in Calcutta, and its neighbourhood, in the indefatigable discharge of the various duties connected with his cure, and in correspondence and communications respecting the state of the Church, he set out, in June, 1825, to make the visitation of his extensive diocese, which led him first across Central India to Bombay, and occupied, exclusive of Madras, which was not then visited, upwards of sixteen months. It was in the course of this journey, in August, 1825, that he preached the second sermon, at the consecration of the church at Secrole, near Benares, and dedicated it to the civil and military officers of Benares, at whose request it was printed. It contains a popular, but forcible exposition of a few weighty truths, appro-

priate to the scene and the occasion, and suited, as we conceive, to the persons whom he addressed; but beautiful as it is in these respects, and instructive in all, we should do great injustice to Dr. Heber were we to offer it as a fair specimen of his talents or eloquence. It is the sort of matter of which his common conversation was made, and of which his mind was full; and we are certain that it would flow from his pen with the same ease, and almost in the same time as it would have fallen from his lips, and nearly in the same words too. The very structure of the sermon leads to the same conclusion—for it is not a regular discourse in which the preacher explains and enlarges upon some particular verse, and then draws his conclusion, but rather a pleasing and interesting commentary upon the whole passage connected with the text: not that we think it less valuable on this account—but we wish our readers to take it for what it is. The text is a fine verse in Genesis, xxviii. 16, 17.

“And Jacob awaked out of his sleep, and he said, Surely the Lord is in this place, and I knew it not. And he was afraid, and said, How dreadful is this place: this is none other but the House of God, and this is the gate of Heaven.”

Nothing can be more simple and impressive than the opening.

“This was the natural and touching exclamation of the Patriarch Jacob, when, in his lonely and perilous journey from Canaan to the land of the Chaldees, the God of his fathers appeared to him in a dream, to confirm him in his faith and service, and to encourage him in his wanderings, with the assurance of an Unseen and Almighty Protector.

“At that time, an outcast, in some degree, from the tents of his father Isaac, and a fugitive from the anger of a justly offended brother; a forlorn and needy wanderer, he had laid him to sleep on the sands of the wilderness, his head supported on a pillow of stone, and his staff and scrip his only riches. But in his dream he saw Heaven opened, and ‘behold a ladder set upon the earth, and the top of it reached to Heaven; and behold the Angels of God ascending and descending on it. And, behold, the Lord stood above it, and said, I am the Lord, the God of Abraham thy father and the God of Isaac; the land whereon thou liest, to thee will I give it and to thy seed; and thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth, and thou shalt spread abroad to the west, and to the east, and to the north, and to the south; and in thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed. And, behold, I am with thee, and will keep thee in all places whither thou goest, and will bring thee again into this land; for I will not leave thee, until I have done that of which I have spoken to thee. And Jacob awaked out of his sleep, and he said, Surely the Lord is in this place, and I knew it not! and he said, How dreadful is this place! this is none other but the house of God, and this is the gate of Heaven.’”—pp. 5—7.

From this passage he draws several inferences.

“Nor is this all. For, secondly, we may learn, from the union which I have noticed as universally observable in Scripture between the promise of worldly blessings and the opportunity of heavenly graces, that the former of these are, in the eyes of the Allwise, only so far valuable as they are means of conducing to the latter; and that whatever wealth, whatever power, whatever personal or mental or worldly advantages, the Most High may in his wisdom extend to us, are not blessings in themselves, but as a way to greater blessedness—as gifts by the use and improvement of which we are required by our God to serve the cause of his Son, and entitle ourselves, (if I may venture to use the expression,) entitle ourselves, through faith, to a more illustrious reward hereafter.

“If the Israelites were endowed beyond the nations of mankind, with wise and righteous laws, with a fertile and almost impregnable territory, with a race of valiant and victorious kings, and a God who (while they kept his ways) was a wall of fire against their enemies round about them; if the kings of the Wilderness did them homage, and the lion banner of David and Solomon was reflected at once from the Mediterranean and the Euphrates; it was, that the way of the Lord might be made known by their means upon earth, and that the saving health of the Messiah might become conspicuous to all nations.

“My brethren, it has pleased the Almighty that the great nation to which we ourselves belong, is a great, a valiant, and understanding nation: it has pleased Him to give us an empire in which the sun never sets, a commerce by which the remotest nations of the earth are become our allies, our tributaries, I had almost said our neighbours, and, by means (when regarded as human means, and distinct from his mysterious providence,) so inadequate as to excite our alarm as well as wonder, the sovereignty over these wide and populous heathen lands.

“But is it for *our* sakes that he has given us these good gifts, and wrought these great marvels in our favour? Are we not rather set up on high in the earth, that we may show forth the light by which we are guided, and be the honoured instruments of diffusing these blessings which we ourselves enjoy, through every land where our will is law, through every tribe where our wisdom is held in reverence, and in every distant isle which our winged vessels visit?

“If we value then (as who does not value?) our renown among mankind; if we exult (as who can help exulting?) in the privileges which the providence of God has conferred on the British nation; if we are thankful (and God forbid we should be otherwise) for the means of usefulness in our power; and if we love (as who does not love?) our native land, its greatness and prosperity; let us see that we, each of us in our station, are promoting to the best of our power, by example, by exertion, by liberality, by the practice of every Christian justice and virtue, the extension of God’s truth among men, and the honour of that holy name whereby we are called.

“There have been realms before as famous as our own, and, (in relation to the then extent and riches of the civilized world,) as powerful and as wealthy, of which the traveller sees nothing now but ruins in the

midst of a wilderness, or where the mariner only finds a rock for fishers to spread their nets.—Nineveh once reigned over the east; but where is Nineveh now? Tyre had once the commerce of the world; but what is become of Tyre? But if the repentance of Nineveh had been persevered in, her towers would have stood to this day. Had the daughter of Tyre brought her gifts to the Temple of God, she would have continued a Queen for ever.”—pp. 13—17.

This passage discloses to us a feature of Bishop Heber’s mind, well known to his friends; very powerful indeed—but softened and directed, as every thing was in him, by Christian piety. We speak of his patriotism—he loved England for the many wise, and great, and good men, she had produced—he loved her for her liberal institutions and laws, and for her many noble, munificent establishments of charity and instruction—he loved too her prosperity and her power: but he loved them chiefly as they were calculated to diffuse the blessings of light, and freedom, and salvation, to the very ends of the earth.

He then proceeds to the third and last lesson, the omnipresence of the Deity—awful, even to good men, but dreadful to the consciences of the wicked.

“It is a dreadful thing, when conscience reckons up her catalogue of secret guilt, to remember that every one of those crimes which were most hateful to God and to man, were done with the knowledge, and in the presence, of the Judge, the severe and upright Judge of men and angels. A dreadful thing it is to know that he, from whom nothing is hidden, while doing, and by whom nothing is forgotten when done, was there in the midst of our foulest lurking-place, in the assembly of our guilty friends and accomplices, his eye bent on our deeds, his anger kindled by our wickedness, and his arm, perhaps, upraised to strike us down to death and hell, if his mercy had not interfered to afford us a little longer time for repentance. A dreadful thing it is to say, surely God was in this place, when I cast my eyes so carefully around and flattered myself that my uncleanness, my robbery, or my fraud, was hid in darkness and solitude. God was in this place, when I deformed his image with drunkenness, and when my mouth was filled with the words of lust and blasphemy. God was in this place, when I called on his holy name, to obtain credit for my falsehood, and challenged his power to punish me if I dealt untruly with my neighbour. And God is in this place, and beholds my present hardness and impenitent heart; he knows and sees my lingering fondness for the sins which I am pretending to abandon; and he is waiting, perhaps even now, for the conduct which I shall now adopt, the resolution which I shall now follow, to determine whether my lot shall be hereafter among the children of light, or whether his Spirit shall be withdrawn from me, (it may be,) for ever.”—(p. 18—20.)

The subject of this passage is a common one, but the handling is that of a master. Nothing can be more impressive and alarming than the manner in which the sense of the divine presence is here enforced upon his hearers. It is a warning, in

which all are more or less interested; for eminently pure and good must that man be, or eminently hardened, who can read it without feeling his mind shrink back upon itself at the remembrance of many an hour, when, regardless that the great eye was upon him, he had been the slave of bad passions, or of vice: without breathing a silent, but heartfelt prayer, to heaven, that in his future life he may be more watchful and more mindful of that awful power, in whom he lives, moves, and has his being.

Finally, he dwells upon the peculiar presence of God in holy places.

In closing our account of these remains of Dr. Heber in India, we are strongly tempted to add a curious and ingenious document, which forms part of the appendix to Mr. Robinson's Sermon, and offers a striking proof of the fertility and variety of his resources. It is a letter drawn up by him in the eastern and apostolic style, and addressed to the new Archbishop, of the Syriac Christians, of St. Thomas, at Travancore, whose history, though generally known, is very interesting. Settled in the Western Shore of the Peninsula, in the very earliest period of the Christian history, the converts of the Apostle Thomas, according to a tradition in St. Jerome, but according to others, of a St. Thomas in the fourth century; they remained for a thousand years in a state of comparative repose, remote from the troubles which afflicted their brethren in Europe, enjoying great political consideration with the princes of the country, and happily exempt from the corruptions of the church of Rome; but excluded also from the light which broke upon Europe at the revival of learning, and deeply tinctured with the Nestorian heresy. In this state they were found by the Portuguese, and the Jesuits, at the close of the sixteenth century, who barbarously burnt their ancient books and records, and grafted upon their former heresy the errors of papal superstition. From this yoke, however, the greater part emancipated themselves, when the Portuguese were driven out by the Dutch, and placed themselves under the authority of the Patriarch of Antioch. With the Dutch and English traders, as Mr. Gibbon remarks, they only exchanged persecution for neglect; but this reproach has been long since effectually wiped away. For many years they have been an object of great interest, with all the distinguished English Clergy who have been connected with India. Dr. Buchanan has written a long account of them, Bishop Middleton visited them more than once. Mr. Mill, who has been always much interested in Syrian literature, has frequently communicated with them; and Bishop Heber from the first was exceedingly anxious to show them kindness, and to avail himself of their assistance. It was an opportunity of this kind which gave

occasion to this letter. Mar Athanasius, the person to whom it is addressed, was proceeding from Antioch to take possession of his see at Travancore, the principal seat of the independent Syrian Christians, when he was accidentally put on shore at Bombay, while the Bishop was there on his visitation. To those who are only acquainted with European manners and resources, the situation of the Archbishop at that time will appear scarcely credible. Venerable as his title was, he was not only without provisions for his journey, without staff or scrip; but filled with anxious fears, respecting his reception at Travancore, where he had learnt that a strong and violent party were prepared to oppose the admission of the Syrian stranger. Bishop Heber received him with kindness and respect, acknowledged him publicly in his metropolitan capacity, supplied him with money from funds which were entrusted to him by the Society for propagating the Gospel, and set him on his way rejoicing; and afterwards, to fill up the measure of his kindness, he addressed to him the following primitive letter:

“To the excellent and learned Father Mar Athanasius, Bishop and Metropolitan of all the Churches of Christ in India, which walk after the rule of the Syrians,—Mar Reginald, by the grace of God, Bishop of Calcutta,—Grace, Mercy, and Peace, from God the Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ.

“I have earnestly desired, honoured Brother in the Lord, to hear of thy safe passage from Bombay, and of thy health and welfare in the land of Malabar. I hope that they have rejoiced at thy coming, even as they rejoiced at the coming of Mar Basilius, Mar Gregorius, and Mar Johannes.* And it is my prayer to God, that He who led our Father Abraham the beloved from the land of his nativity, through faith, to a strange and distant country, may in like manner guide, protect, and prosper thee, in health and grace, and every good gift, in the love of thy people, and the spiritual fruit which thou shalt receive of them; as it is written, ‘Commit thy way unto the Lord, and trust in Him: and He shall bring it to pass.’

“Especially, I have been desirous to hear from thee of the good estate of our brethren, the faithful in Malabar, the bishops, presbyters, and deacons; and also of my own children in Christ, the English presbyters who sojourn among you at Cottayam; may God reward you for your love towards them, and may the good will which is between you be daily stablished and strengthened!

“Furthermore, I will you to know, my brother, that the desire of my heart and my prayer to the Lord is, that the holy name of Jesus may be yet further known among all nations; and also, that all who love Him may love one another; to the intent that they which are without,

* The last *Syrian* Bishops (before Mar Athanasius in 1825) who went to rule the Church in Malabar in 1751; all the Metropolitans after them, (called Mar Dionysius, or Cyrillus, or Philoxenus, severally,) being *Indian* Bishops of their ordaining.

beholding the unity and peace that is among you, may glorify God also in the day of their visitation. Like as was the desire and prayer of the holy Bishop Thomas Middleton, my honoured predecessor in this ministry; whose memory is blessed among the saints of Christ, whether they be of the English or the Syrian family; not that there are two families, but one, which both in heaven and earth is named after His name who sitteth at the right hand of God, in whom all nations, tribes, and languages, are united and shall be glorified together.

“I also pray thee to write me word how thyself and they that are with thee fare, and how my own children the English presbyters fare, and in what manner of conversation they walk with you. Furthermore, it is my hope, that by God’s blessing, I may be strengthened shortly to pass to Madras, Tranjore, and Trichinopoly, visiting the churches there which belong to my nation: whence my mind is, if God will, to pass on to salute thee, my brother, and the churches under thee, that I may have joy beholding your order, and partaking in your prayers. And if there be any thing more, it may be explained when we meet; for a letter is half an interview, but it is a good time when a man speaketh face to face with his friend.

“This letter is sent by the hand of a learned and godly man, John Doran, one of the presbyters from before me: who purposeth, with thy permission, to sojourn in Cottayam, even as the presbyters, Benjamin Bayley, Joseph Fenn, and Henry Baker, have sojourned until now with license of the godly bishops of the Church of Malabar, to teach learning and piety to all who thirst after instruction, doing good, and offending no man. And I beseech thee, brother, for my sake, and the sake of the Gospel, to receive him as a son, and as a faithful servant of our Lord, who is alone, with the Holy Ghost, most high in the glory of God the Father: to whom be all honour and dominion for ever. Amen.

“Moreover, I beseech thee, brother, to beware of the emissaries of the Bishop of Rome, whose hands have been dipped in the blood of the saints, from whose tyranny our Church in England hath been long freed by the blessing of God, and we hope to continue in that freedom for ever: of whom are they of Goa, Cranganor, and Verapoli, who have in time past done the Indian Church much evil. I pray that those of thy Churches in Malabar,* who are yet subject to these men, may arouse themselves and be delivered from their hands. Howbeit, the Lord desireth not the death of a sinner, but his mercies are over all his works, and He is found of them that sought him not.

“Our brother Abraham, Legate of the Armenian nation, who is sent from his Patriarch at Jerusalem,—may God rescue his holy city from the hands of the Ishmaelites!—who is with us in Calcutta, salutes thee. He also brings a letter which was sent by his hand to thee from the Syrian Patriarch at Jerusalem, and has not found means hitherto of forwarding it to thee at Malabar: and has therefore requested me to send it now to thee. All the Church of Christ that is here salutes thee.

* *i. e.* all Churches of the Syro-chaldaic ritual, one half of which still are under the Romish yoke imposed by the Synod of Diamper. See Geddes and La Croze.

Salute in my name thy brethren Mar Dionysius, and Mar Philoxenus,* with the presbyters and deacons.—We, William Mill and Thomas Robinson, presbyters, that write this epistle in the Lord, salute you.

“The blessing of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, be with you evermore. Amen.

“ (Signed in Syriac) REGINALD, BISHOP.

“ *By the help of God, let this letter go to the region of Travancore, to the City of Cottayam, and let it be delivered into the hands of the grave and venerable Bishop, Mar Athanasius, Metropolitan of the Church of Malabar.*”

The Bishop left Bombay in the middle of August, and after a short voyage landed at the southern extremity of Ceylon; from which place he went to Colombo, Kandy, &c. With the state of this island, he was exceedingly gratified; but being compelled by many reasons to hasten to Calcutta, he stayed only five weeks there; though he could, as he said himself, have employed himself most agreeably and profitably for as many months.

He arrived at his Indian home, on the Ganges, in October, after an absence of sixteen months. His notes, during the whole of the visitation, but particularly through the north, were very ample, and if, as is not impossible, they should be one day given to the world—we are confident they will be found exceedingly interesting and instructive. In the meantime, we cannot in justice to the cause, withhold the substance of a few cheering observations which he made, as the result of his visitation. Among the white population he found a greater degree of piety and good conduct, than he had reason to expect—while the number of native converts in the Upper Provinces, both pleased and surprised him—particularly he was delighted with the affectionate and grateful manner in which Archdeacon Corrie, who accompanied him in a great part of his visitation, was received by his own converts. Looking, however, mainly to education as the great means of success in the propagation of Christianity, it was grateful to him to perceive, that schools for native children, and half-caste, were generally established at all our stations in the northern and eastern parts of India. Amongst these, several female schools at Calcutta, and in the neighbourhood, had especially attracted his attention; in which, not only the native children of the poorer class, but even of the higher castes, were admitted: and, what was more encouraging, many rich Indians contributed to their support, and were glad to take their servants from them. The surmounting of this obstacle he considered a great victory, particularly as it was achieved without uneasiness; for although their prejudices

* The former governor of the Church, who resigned the chair to the last Mar Dionysius, and now lives in voluntary retirement at Codaungalangary, or Anhur in the North.

as to caste were scrupulously respected, and the Christian religion was not pressed upon them, yet, as they read daily passages from the Bible, they must, he concluded, by degrees, be thus furnished with the means of judging between the two religions, which is all that could be wished. He allowed, however, that conversion was obstructed by great difficulties, and must proceed slowly and cautiously till Providence should be pleased to point out other aids; and he felt too, that it was sometimes involuntarily impeded by the unbridled zeal of sincere, but imprudent friends, which required much judgment, kindness, and temper, to repress.

The island of Ceylon, beautiful and interesting to him in every point of view, was particularly delightful in that which was nearest to his heart. He found Christianity making so great a progress amongst its inhabitants, under the auspices of the clergy now resident, a most excellent and respectable body of men, as to give him reason to hope that along the coast, at least, it would soon be the received religion; especially, as being worshippers of Budh, the prejudices of *caste* were little felt amongst them. The interior of the island, indeed, presented a prospect less favourable, being covered, for the most part, with an impenetrable and unwholesome jungle, and given up to idolatry; but as Sir E. Barnes, the present governor, was indefatigable in making roads, &c., he hoped that this obstacle would be soon removed, and that civilization and Christianity would advance amongst them together.

In the district of Columbo and Galle, alone, the bishop confirmed above three hundred natives, and the Cingabere and Malabar churches were very respectably attended. These were served by two native chaplains, both most exemplary men, and who do infinite good in the island. The Missionaries far surpassed all he had expected; instead of being enthusiastic and ill-judging men, as some reports had led him to suppose, he found them a quiet, steady, industrious body, giving up their whole time to the service of God, and respected and beloved by all who know them, whether black or white.

Female infanticide prevails to a dreadful extent in some of the provinces—in one, the number of women is barely half that of the men.

He had not yet visited Madras and its dependencies; and it was his intention to have set out earlier in the year, which was the proper season; but circumstances over which he had no control, delayed him till the spring.

The following account of his death is extracted from the Calcutta Gazette:—

“On the 14th current, a feeling of grief was spread through every rank of society in Calcutta, by the painful intelligence of the above melancholy event. His Lordship arrived at Trichinopoly on the 1st

instant : on the morning of the 2d he preached, and held a Confirmation in the evening. On the morning of the 3d, he rose at day-break, and attended Divine Service, at the Mission Church, in the Fort ; and on his return home, after visiting Mr. Robinson, his chaplain, who was indisposed, he repaired to dress and bathe. Having remained in the bath longer than usual, his servant entered the apartment, and found his master insensible in the water. Assistance was immediately procured, but every attempt to restore animation was unsuccessful. Upon examination, the vessels of the head were found much distended with blood, and it was the opinion of the medical gentlemen, that the death of his Lordship was occasioned by apoplexy. The Bishop had exhibited unusual heaviness in the morning, when called from his repose, and when undressing for the bath ; and this indisposition, induced in all probability by previous exertion and fatigue, was no doubt rendered fatal by the revulsion occasioned by sudden immersion in a cold bath."—*Calcutta Government Gazette*.

We have involuntarily dwelt so long upon the character of Dr. Heber, as presented to us in his own brief, but interesting memorials, that we have less room for the many testimonies offered by others, to the full development and expansion of his fine qualities in that high station, and vast field, which India presented to him. In adverting to the meetings, held in different Presidencies, on the occasion of his death, we have only to remark, that the speeches made were highly honourable to the feelings, as well as to the talents of those who delivered them ; and that they form altogether, coming from so many persons high in station, but of different professions, not only a valuable testimony to the merits of Bishop Heber, but a powerful incitement and encouragement, to an earnest and conscientious discharge of the same office hereafter. With a view, however, to the object already stated, we prefer to rest chiefly upon Mr. Robinson's Sermons, who, having been his Chaplain and his friend ; the companion of his travels ; the partaker of his labours, and of his counsels ; is certainly most competent to bring us acquainted with his ministerial character and life. His discourse, too, has the merit of being written and preached immediately after his death, and nearly on the spot ; and from the warm and unaffected feeling of sorrow, as well as admiration, expressed in it, we might venture to infer, as the Jews from our Saviour's tears, over the grave of Lazarus ; " See, how he loved him."

The text is from Luke, xii. 42, 43, 44.

" Who then is that faithful and wise steward whom his Lord shall make ruler over his household, to give them their portion of meat in due season ? Blessed is that servant, whom his Lord, when he cometh, shall find so doing. Of a truth I say unto you, that he will make him ruler over all that he hath."

After a few prefatory observations, he thus describes the conduct of the Bishop in India.

“ Little more than two years have elapsed since he first arrived in India, but in that short period he had visited almost every station where a Christian Church could be assembled ; and, while engaged in the longest and most difficult duties of any Bishop, since the earlier ages of Christianity, he employed himself, wherever he came, not only in the higher functions of his office, but in the more humble and laborious duties of an ordinary pastor. He had thus become known to all his clergy, and to all his people, in the plains and mountains of Hindostan, in the wilder tracts of Central India, in the stations of Guzerat, the Deckan, and the western coast ; in the hills and valleys of Ceylon ; and in these southern provinces, the scene of his latest labours, and henceforth of his dearest memory.

“ In the course of these journeys, and in all his other labours, his heart was most earnestly and intently fixed, not only on the government of the existing Church, but on the extension of Christ's kingdom in these strong holds of heathen and Mahomedan superstition. He delighted to consider himself as the chief missionary of India, a character implied, in his judgment, in the nature of his episcopal office itself : and while he felt it to be his bounden duty to confine his pecuniary aid and direct influence to the establishments of that Church, whose orders and ministry he received as apostolical, yet most sincerely did he rejoice in the successful labours of all Christian Societies of whatever denomination, in the field of India ; for he felt, that, while marshalled against a common enemy, there should be none other than a generous rivalry, and a brotherly emulation between our separate hosts ; and, that even thus the fortune of the field is best secured, if each army keeps its own ranks unbroken, and its own discipline inviolate. The several Societies connected with our Church partook largely of his regard and active support ; particularly the venerable chartered Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, whose general cause, as connected with their central establishment of Bishop's College, he had successfully pleaded at the several Presidencies of Bombay, Colombo, and Calcutta ; and which he purposed, on his return from Madras, to recommend there also to the benevolence of the Christian world :—the Church Missionary Society, to whose labours, and the character of their missionaries, he repeatedly bore the most honourable testimony : and the venerable Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, whose interests literally occupied his dying thoughts.

“ The missions of this last-named Society, at Tanjore and in this place, the foundations of the apostolic Schwartz and the apostolic men who have walked and are still walking in his steps, awakened, in a most powerful degree, and beyond any thing he had previously seen, the affections of his heart ; and to devise and arrange a plan for their revived and more extended prosperity, was the object which occupied for many days, and to the last hour of his life (as several who now hear me can bear witness), his anxious thoughts, his earnest prayers, and the concentrated energies of his mind. Again and again did he repeat to

me, that all which he had witnessed in the native congregations of these missions,—their numbers, their general order, their devout attendance on the services of the Church, exceeded every expectation he had formed; and that in their support and revival he saw the fairest hope of extending the Church of Christ. Never shall I forget the warm expressions of his delight, when, on Easter-day, he gathered them around him as his children, as one family with ourselves, administered to them the body and blood of our common Saviour, and blest them in their native tongue: and when, in the evening of that day, he had seen before him not less than 1300 natives of those districts, rescued from idolatry and superstition, and joining, as with one heart and voice, in the prayers and praises of our Church,—I can never forget his exclamation, that he would gladly purchase that day with years of life.

“Those of you who heard his parting address on the succeeding day, from the grave of Schwartz, will never lose the deep impression of that solemn moment, when (as if he had foreseen that his departure was at hand) he commended you to God and to the word of his grace, charging you by the love of your Saviour and of each other, and animating you by the memory of your departed Father, and by the near prospect of your eternal reward, to perseverance, fidelity, and Christian order. Of his last public ministrations in this place, I need not speak to you; the memory of them is fresh in every heart; you treasure them as the last words of a departed friend. You remember well the earnestness and affection of his manner, how *he exhorted, and comforted, and charged every one of you, as a father doth his children, that ye would walk worthy of God who hath called you to his kingdom and glory.* Alas! who could have foreseen, while hanging on those lips, that they would so soon be closed in death; that the voice of your shepherd, whom you had just begun to love, should be heard by you again no more for ever! His sun was in its meridian power; and its warmth most genial, when it was suddenly eclipsed for ever. He fell, as the standard-bearer of the cross should ever wish to fall, by no lingering delay, but in the firmness and vigour of his age, and in the very act of combat and of triumph. His master came suddenly, and found him faithful in his charge, and waiting for His appearing. His last hour was spent in his Lord's service, and in ministering to the humblest of his flock. He had scarcely put off the sacred robes with which he served at the altar of his God on earth, when he was suddenly admitted to his sanctuary on high, and clothed with the garments of immortality.

“What mean then these tears for his removal? and why mourn we for our departed father as men without hope? He was that faithful and wise steward, whom his Lord had made ruler over his household, to give them their portion of meat in due season. And Oh, blessed! eternally blessed, *‘is that servant whom his Lord when he came found so doing!’* He has exchanged a life of labour, and anxiety, and imperfection, for the repose and blessedness of heaven. His warfare is accomplished; and he has passed from the conflicts of the church on earth to the glories of an everlasting triumph.”—pp. 22—27.

We would gladly extract largely from Mr. Corrie's sermon,

preached at the cathedral church of Calcutta, if we were not afraid to trespass upon the time of our readers by any thing which might appear like repetition. We cannot refrain, however, from one or two short passages. The first shows the sense entertained of the importance of episcopacy in India among the clergy, and of the effects already produced by it.

“ In this country the members of our Church were long left without any semblance of discipline ; but of late years we have enjoyed a superintendence approaching near to the scripture model on that head : it has been a rule of superior knowledge, of superior activity, piety, and love. Much good arose to many from the labours of individual ministers in this place, in former days ; but how much more of *general* benefit has arisen to our community since the establishment of Episcopal Government among us !

“ But as, under the Mosaic Dispensation, the High Priests were not allowed to remain by reason of death, so have we with peculiar emphasis experienced in this our Zion. How are we instructed by the sudden removal of our ecclesiastical ruler !—‘ O put not your trust in princes, nor in any child of man ; for there is no help in them !’ To him who, in a certain and most important sense, is the alone Shepherd and Bishop of His Church, must our expectations be directed, and our prayers offered up, that in judgment He would remember mercy, and raise up to us a successor of a similar spirit—one who, like him whose loss we deplore, will feed the flock with understanding, and rule them faithfully with all his power.”—pp. 9, 10.

The second is produced for the purpose of exhibiting, in combination with an extract from Sir Chas. Grey’s Speech, a remarkable feature of Dr. Heber’s mind, his firm devotion to the great object of his office ; and how little either the disappointments or vexations on the one hand, or the indulgence of his own cultivated taste and conversation on the other, were able to divert him from the cheerful prosecution of it.

“ The spirit of of St. Paul, in those words to the Romans, appears in a remarkable degree to have animated him—‘ I am a debtor both to the Greeks and to the Barbarians, both to the wise and to the unwise. So, as much as in me is, I am ready to preach the gospel to you that are at Rome also. For I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ : for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth :’ Rom. i. 14—16. With this devotion to his object, what a mild, forbearing, and gentle spirit—what tenderness, affection, and persevering self-command—were united !”—pp. 13, 14.

Again,

“ Our greatly beloved Bishop was not without those trials which are common to man : but, in respect of whatever personal inconvenience might lie in the way of the line of duty which he had prescribed for himself, his language was, ‘ None of these things move me.’ ”—p. 16.

Compare this with Sir Charles Grey's Speech.

“ To this large assemblage I fear I might appeal in vain, if I were to ask, that *he* should step forward, who had never felt his spirit to sink when he thought of his native home, and felt that a portion of his heart was in a distant land : who had never been irritated by the annoyance, or embittered by the disappointment of India. I feel shame to say, that I am not the man who could answer the appeal. The Bishop was the only one, whom I have ever known, who was entirely master of these feelings. Disappointments and annoyances came to him as they come to all ; but he met and overcame them with a smile ; and when he has known a different effect produced on others, it was his usual wish that ‘ they were but as happy as himself.’ Connected with this alacrity of spirit, and in some degree springing out of it, was his activity. I apprehend that few persons, civil or military, have undergone as much labour, traversed as much country, seen and regulated so much, as he had done, in the small portion of time which had elapsed since he entered on his office ; and if death had not broken his career, his friends know that he contemplated no relaxation of exertions. But this was not a mere restless activity or result of temperament : it was united with a fervent zeal, not fiery nor ostentatious, but steady and composed ; which none could appreciate, but those who intimately knew him. I was struck myself, upon the renewal of our acquaintance, by nothing so much as the observation, that though he talked with animation on all subjects, there was nothing on which his intellect was bent, no prospect on which his imagination dwelt, no thought which occupied habitually his vacant moments, but the furtherance of that great design of which he had been made the principal instrument in this country. Of the same unobtrusive character was the piety which filled his heart : it is seldom that of so much there is so little ostentation. All here knew his good-natured and unpretending manner ; but I have seen unequivocal testimonies, both before and since his death, that under that cheerful and gay aspect there were feelings of serious and unremitting devotion, of perfect resignation, of tender kindness for all mankind, which would have done honour to a saint. When to these qualities you add his desire to conciliate, which had everywhere won all hearts—his amiable demeanour, which invited a friendship that was confirmed by the innocence and purity of his manners, which bore the most scrutinizing and severe examination—you will readily admit that there was in him a rare assemblage of all that deserves esteem and admiration.”—pp. 30, 31.

We cannot close our notice of this amiable, learned, and excellent man, without casting an anxious thought towards the state of those vast spiritual interests in India, over which he so lately presided, and more especially of that venerable office in the discharge of which he died. It is now nearly eleven years since the experiment (for such it has hitherto been) was commenced, and whether we look to the simple facts, as they appear in the history

of the period, or to the opinions which persons in India most capable of judging rightly have formed respecting them, there are two conclusions which we have a right to draw. 1st. That the administration of our religion by bishops, has been productive of great advantage to the Christian cause, in whatever view it be regarded; and 2d. That this advantage has only fallen short of our fair and legitimate expectations, in consequence of the narrow scale upon which the experiment has been made. The first of these propositions has been affirmed, directly or indirectly, by many, and contradicted by none; the second, we think, is equally evident. That the burthen of the Episcopal office in India would be too heavy for the shoulders of a single man, might have been naturally conjectured by any one, who would only have cast a glance at the immense extent of our possessions in India, and considered the distances by which the presidencies are separated from each other, the difficulties of the land journeys, and the nature of the climate in all. But had he reflected further upon the various views, characters, and connections of the clergy themselves, whom it was the duty of the Bishop to superintend, the many new relations to be formed and supported with the Company and its officers, and above all, the wants of an immense mass of heathen population coming in contact with him on every side, we do not see how this conclusion could have been resisted. Unhappily, it is now no longer matter of speculation;—two costly victims have been already offered;—and if the system should be continued as it is, we seem driven to the alternative, either that the office itself must fall into disrepute by being negligently administered, or being confided to more generous spirits, must again bear them down, one by one, overwhelming their families with grief, and leaving dark and dreary intervals between.

Bishop Middleton, to whom was committed the arduous task of clearing the ground, laying the foundation, and adjusting the various parts of the Episcopal edifice, amongst strangers not always well disposed towards the work, was a man of great vigour, mental and bodily; and having survived this labour, which he executed with great industry and ability, and being inured to the climate, it might have been imagined, that he was perfectly competent to the discharge of the ordinary duties of the office; and yet, in so many years, he was never able to effect a complete visitation of his diocese, and not long before his death, he declared solemnly to Mr. Trant, his conviction, which he wished to be communicated for the benefit of others, that he was fast sinking under the weight of a heavy burthen to which his constitution was unequal. The career of Dr. Heber was terminated much more abruptly; and although from the natural buoyancy of his mind

and the excitements under which he lived, he seems to have been insensible to the effects of his own incessant labour in such a climate,* there was one who watched with an anxious eye over his welfare, from whom it could not be concealed, that before the attack which proved fatal to him, he was so much altered and reduced in appearance as to excite serious apprehensions in his behalf. Under a very natural impression produced by these facts, the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge, at a very full meeting, the Archbishop of Canterbury in the chair, agreed to the following Memorial, which contains, as we conceive, all that can be said most urgent upon the question.

MEMORIAL

To the Honourable Court of Directors of the East India Company.

The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, having assembled in a Special General Meeting, for the purpose of testifying its respect for the memory of the late deeply lamented Bishop of Calcutta, adverts with feelings of the most painful recollection to the short period which has elapsed since it was called upon to pay the like tribute to the memory of his illustrious predecessor; and considers it a paramount duty humbly and earnestly to represent to the Honourable Court of Directors of the East India Company the necessity for an enlarged Ecclesiastical Establishment in the East.

The Society returns its grateful thanks for the protection and assistance which it has uniformly experienced from your Honourable Court, in aid of its various endeavours to promote Christian knowledge in the East: and it cordially joins in the general acknowledgement of the important benefits that have arisen from the introduction of episcopal authority, and for an increased provision for the spiritual wants of the British inhabitants of India. But, at the same time, so many inconveniences have arisen from the attempt to govern the Indian church by a single Prelate, that the Society ventures to declare its conviction, too fatally confirmed by the past, that no individual, however endowed with bodily and mental vigour, can be sufficient for the exertions rendered necessary by the overwhelming magnitude of the diocese of Calcutta.

A visitation of that diocese cannot be accomplished without traversing the whole of India, and undertaking long voyages by sea, nor consequently without a greater exposure to perilous varieties of climate, than is required of any civil officer in the East. So great indeed is the difficulty of this duty, that Bishop Middleton, although his life was spared for nine years, died before he could complete it; and Bishop Heber sank under the labour of his primary visitation. And it is the opinion of the Society, that nothing but the division of the diocese of Calcutta can prevent a continual sacrifice of valuable lives, and a perpetually recurring

* It is not generally known that he was in so much danger in Guzerat, as to write letters to his mother and sister under the strong impression of impending death.

interruption of the great work for the performance of which that Episcopal Establishment was formed.

The Society would also respectfully suggest to your Honourable Court that, as the constitution of the Government in India is constructed upon the principle of a separate administration at each of the three Presidencies, it must necessarily be inconvenient not to assimilate the government of the Church to that system which experience has proved to be so beneficial in the civil, judicial, and military departments. Such a measure would prevent the suspension of business, now occasioned by the long and frequent absence of the head of the Church from the seat of the supreme Government, and by the immense distance to which he is carried in the course of his visitation.

The Society further begs leave to represent to your Honourable Court the peculiar bad effect of the interruptions which occur under the present system, upon various Institutions for promoting Christian knowledge.

The Protestant Missions in Southern India, so long under the care of this Society, received the greatest benefit from the personal superintendence of Bishop Middleton. But he was only enabled to visit them once; and ten years elapsed between that event and the primary visitation of Bishop Heber. And now these Missions, of which Bishop Heber, after having been a witness to their effects, often emphatically said, "that the strength of the Christian cause in India was *there*," and which were beginning to derive the most important advantages from his presence, are once more deprived of the privilege of being governed by a Prelate personally acquainted with their condition.

Bishop's College in Calcutta, also, which promises to become the chief source of Missionary exertions in India, was struggling with the difficulties inseparable from infancy, when it lost the support of its founder Bishop Middleton. His successor had little opportunity of displaying that zeal for its welfare which increased in his mind as he became more fully acquainted with its value; and it is to be feared, that another obstacle to its progress has been raised up by the death of its second visitor.

If it be supposed, that in these and similar cases the Archdeacons might supply the place of Episcopal superintendence, it must be remembered that those officers can never exercise the peculiar functions of a Bishop, nor can their services be effective unless the officers themselves enjoy opportunities of frequent personal communication with their Diocesan—while in India, such communication is prevented by the wide distance of some of the Archdeacons from Calcutta, and is entirely suspended during the vacancy of the See.

The Society, therefore, humbly trust, that your Honourable Court, taking these circumstances into its favourable consideration, and advertising, at the same time, to the fact, that since the erection of the See at Calcutta, the British dominions in India have been greatly augmented, the Chaplains on the Honourable East India Company's establishment nearly doubled, ample provision made for the encouragement of Mahomedan and Hindoo learning, education freely offered to natives of all classes, and Missionary establishments, in connection with the Church of England, instituted at each Presidency, will be pleased to take such measures as your Honourable Court in its wisdom may deem fit, for

promoting the erection of additional Sees at the Presidencies of Madras and Bombay.

The Society hopes, that it may be justified for thus strongly urging the prayer of its memorial. The subject has been pressed upon its notice from various quarters—and it considers itself only as expressing the opinion of all those whose attention has been turned to the promotion of Christian knowledge in the East.

Admitting the validity of this reasoning, the subject seems to resolve itself into this question, whether the continuance of Episcopacy in India affords a prospect of advantage commensurate with the increased expense of that more extensive and effective support of it which is necessary to its welfare.

In considering this question, the first thing which presents itself is the household of faith, our own countrymen in India. And here, we see no reason why India, extended and aggrandized as she is at present, and absorbing so large a portion of our population, civil and military, should be deprived of the tried advantage confessedly arising in England, from the blending of religious persons and influence, through all the mass of society and in every rank of life. Hitherto, perhaps, the state of things might not have been ripe for it: but now, as every presidency in India has its aristocracy, consisting of judges and generals, and members of council, and counsellors high in the law, is it not right that there should be a bishop and an archdeacon in every presidency too—to keep alive and to cherish the vast concerns of eternity, amidst the suggestions of ambition, interest and pleasure, which always clamor to be heard? How much has been already effected in this way, may be clearly discovered from the speeches at the public meetings in honour of Dr. Heber's memory. Nor can we hesitate to believe that this salutary movement will be always much more easily propagated in the classes below, if it be found to receive a strong impulse from those above. And where, let it be asked, will be found, in the whole range of British power, a body of men to whom the consolations and the warnings of Christianity are more valuable and more necessary than to our countrymen in India? To those who are hastening to be rich, of whom the great body of our Indian population is composed, how essential is the frequent and impressive warning, that they are likely to fall into a temptation and a snare!—while to the disappointed, the sorrowful, and the sick, of which too, we fear, there is a considerable number, what balm so sweet and consoling as that which the prospects of Christianity lay open? Besides, we know how effectual are external forms, and even names, in supporting internal piety, and how little indeed they are good for else; and upon this principle, we conceive, it will be no mean advantage, that both

the youth who go out to India, and the men of mature age who return from it to England, will find on their arrival, not only the same services to resort to, but the same offices and dignities which they have before been accustomed to revere.

Another advantage likely to be attained by the establishment of Episcopacy upon a more efficient and extensive plan in India, will be a nearer approach to unity of doctrine and discipline amongst the clergy of the Establishment, than it has hitherto been possible to attain, on account of the different sources from which they have been sent out, and the different authorities on which they depend. This is a want of high and growing importance, nor do we see any effective remedy but the superintendence of several enlightened men of acknowledged merit and of the highest authority, actuated by common principles and looking to the same end, but each the centre of a system, in which every part below may be near enough to profit by his influence. Under such auspices we do not anticipate any serious difficulty in preserving this desirable understanding; for if there be a region in the world where an enlarged charity is more practicable and more necessary than any other, it must surely be India, where a common cause, involving the fundamentals of Christianity, furnishes a bond and a motive of union not to be found elsewhere: a cause which should not only induce the clergy of our own Church to lower the standard of their petty differences, but of power enough to bring over the sectaries who dissent from us, to range themselves under the common banner of our National Church.

And this brings us to the consideration of another part of the subject, mainly depending upon a more effective Episcopacy in India, and which cannot be excluded from the question, viz. The spiritual wants of the native population.

However low may be the opinion entertained by some persons in this or in that hemisphere respecting the degree of success likely to attend even our best-directed efforts in the conversion of the Hindoos, it would be base and shameful to abandon it when so many new prospects seem rising to our hopes. It is quite impossible that men of any class, rightly imbued with Christian principles, can be indifferent to the state of so many millions of their fellow-creatures and fellow-subjects, not only involved in the grossest superstition and idolatry, but under the influence of a religion confessedly hostile in its doctrines and ordinances to all moral and political improvement: least of all can the clergy be excused for despairing of such a cause. They cannot be regardless of their great Master's solemn injunction, "Go ye, and teach all nations;" they cannot cease from plying that holy work in which their predecessors have so long laboured even with joy: whatever be their quality, denomination, or opi-

nions, by whomsoever delegated or paid, they have a commission from a common Master, who is above all, which they cannot forego: nor need they to lose sight of it for a single moment, for while they are endeavouring earnestly to inculcate by their preaching and example the genuine fruits of Christianity upon their flocks, they may comfort themselves with the thought, that they are contributing to remove that worst obstacle to the propagation of the Christian faith, the bad lives of its professors. "Who knows," says the venerable Schwartz, after labouring nearly fifty years in the vineyard, "but God may remove some of the great obstacles to the propagation of the Gospel. Should a reformation take place among the Europeans, it would be the greatest blessing to the country."

But deeply impressed as we are with the necessity and duty of continuing these exertions, and confident, in God's good time, of their final triumph, we are perfectly aware how much, both of the success and of the credit of our cause, will depend upon the spirit with which it is undertaken, and the instruments by which it is carried on. And, happily, upon this point intelligent men of all parties seem to be agreed.

It is admitted by Sir John Malcolm, an author of the highest reputation, while he deprecates all interference of government, that there are two safe and legitimate channels for the diffusing of Christianity in that country, viz. the labours of missionaries and the extension of general knowledge; and this statement we consider in all its parts as calculated to throw great light upon the whole argument before us. The channels pointed out in it are precisely those to which the Church of England has always directed its chief attention, and on which she now relies; and while, on the one hand, it shows the great value of the missionaries and the attention which is due to them, it indicates no less, on the other, the necessity of an enlightened superintendence by persons of acknowledged authority, to give harmony and consistency to their labour, and to repress the ardour of unbridled zeal, whenever it may occur. Under this view of the matter, we can understand well what Bishop Heber meant, when Mr. Robinson describes him as saying, that he desired to be considered as the chief of the missionaries in India.

Again—"The Church of India should rise," says the eloquent eulogist of Bishop Heber, "in quietness and beauty, like that new Temple described by himself in his '*Palestine*,' in the erection of which—

'No hammer fell, no ponderous axes rung;
Like some tall palm the mystic fabric sprung.'

For this purpose it should be founded in wisdom and peace, strengthened by candour, kindness, and charity; and while the

light of education and civilization should be constantly thrown around it, no discord should reign within its walls, nor violence proceed from its border.

These are, in truth, the arts which the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge has constantly impressed upon its missionaries on their departure for India;* these are the arts by which the admirable Schwartz, and those who followed in his steps, acquired the confidence of the native powers and smoothed the way for that extension of the Church in Tanjore, which caused Bishop Heber to exclaim, that *there* was the strength of the Christian cause in India; these, in fine, are the arts by which Dr. Heber himself obtained the affection and co-operation of all intelligent and influential men in India; and by these too must every one be imbued who hopes to support and to propagate effectually the same holy cause.

But to complete this noble work, Sir Charles Grey states, in the close of his speech, that many hands and many spirits like Bishop Heber's must be engaged; and it is precisely this union which the present measure is calculated to obtain. We wish for several spirits like his, constituting a permanent body in India, not again to be dissolved by a single blow, but constantly and regularly, by their authority, influence, and example, guiding the many hands below them in the same earnest but peaceful course of duty. Such spirits indeed, he says, are rarely to be found, and on this account he considers the loss as irreparable. We would not yield to this distinguished man in his opinion of Dr. Heber, whom we have known intimately for many years; we believe that a mind more pure from earthy dross, more variously and richly gifted and adorned, more nicely balanced and more sweetly tempered and attuned, is scarcely to be found on British ground; but it would be an injury to our Establishment to deny, that there are many persons in its body able and willing to pursue successfully the same course. Charity, humility, earnestness, and piety, are the genuine fruits of our religion; add to these knowledge, and you have all that is required; and if our Established Church, fed and strengthened as she is by our schools and colleges, and backed by our national endowments and civil privileges, should be unable to furnish both a present supply and a succession of such enlightened men, she would but ill fulfil the duties which these advantages impose upon her. On this account it is that we claim this distinction for her, not as a privilege to enjoy, but as a cross and a burthen to bear—not as a station for learned ease to repose on, or in which cupidity may realize her dreams—but as a painful pre-eminence, for which ignorance and

* See the Collection of Speeches to the Missionaries, collected by Archdeacon Pott, particularly an admirable address of Bishop Middleton,

indolence are alike unfit, and to which none but the sincere and the earnest would aspire.

Guided by such principles, we are inclined to hope that the propagation of the Christian faith in India, so far from being a source of disquietude to the government, will recommend itself to their gratitude, as conducive to their best and soundest policy. And this conviction has been much more strongly impressed upon us, by a fact lately offered to our notice, under circumstances of singular weight and authority. There are four writers,* whose opinions are now before the public, upon the government of India: all men of great ability, and lately holding high situations in the service; (amongst them Sir John Malcolm and Lieut.-Colonel Stewart;) and though they differ very materially from each other upon other points, they all agree in this most important one:—viz. the necessity of admitting natives to situations of higher trust and emolument than they are now capable of enjoying. We presume not to estimate the difficulties which must await the different steps of this process, or the several cautions and remedies which may be suggested to prevent or to remove them; but we are convinced, that from the latter, the Christian religion neither can nor ought to be excluded. It is notorious, that the religious creed of the Mahometan, and especially that of the Hindoo, is not merely a speculative faith. It enters largely into their principles of morals—the rights of their fellow creatures, and the usages of common life; and it must enter too into their counsels and conduct when in power, unless their prejudices and bigotry can be softened by better lights gradually let into their minds, in proportion as they are admitted to higher degrees of trust, or counteracted by the growth of some other powerful principle, on the part of the ruling nation, we do not see how this union can be either stable or secure. To both these desirable ends, Christianity, if rightly administered and respected, must essentially contribute: and on this account, as well as others, we deem it to be the duty of the government to establish it upon a solid and extensive basis—to give honour and respect to its services and its ministers, and to encourage the diffusion of its doctrines and precepts by every means which may be consistent with policy and good faith. Sir Thomas Monro, we hear, has openly declared, that a few such men as Bishop Heber would add great strength to the government of India. And what was the life of Bishop Heber but a beautiful exhibition of the Christian Faith!

We think it dangerous in this country to admit Catholics to a participation of political power; but what are the differences between Catholics and Protestants, acknowledging one God and Saviour and one code of morals, when compared with those pow-

* See the Quarterly Review, Dec. 1826.

erful elements of disunion which separate the Hindoo and the Mahometan from the Christian.

But, finally, in estimating the cost of this arrangement, there is another point of view in which the question will force itself upon our attention, and which, though in some respects humiliating, is not without its portion of encouragement. Even to those who are disposed to look with the most favourable eye upon the history of our policy in India, it must, we think, appear that, in the course of so many struggles, conquests, and revolutions, in which the stern plea of necessity has been often urged, and the grasping spirit of avarice or ambition has been at hand to profit by it, there is much for us to regret towards that numerous and ancient people, and much to expiate; and though it may be true, considering the wild and arbitrary character of its various native dynasties, that our interference may have rescued them from severer ills, and have given to their population a security of life and property, which they could not otherwise have obtained, yet it will not be denied that the protection we have afforded has been often most expensive and onerous to them. Under this impression it must, we think, be the ardent wish and prayer of every patriotic Christian, that the work of expiation may be carried on, not by like evils, inflicted upon us, but by new benefits conferred upon them, of which we may be the instruments; and as we believe in our hearts, that of all the blessings placed by Providence in our power, there is none so gracious in the sight of heaven, so precious to mankind, as the gift of the Christian religion; we are bound upon this principle, nationally and individually, to concur in every wise plan calculated to promote it. Of such a nature we have shown the establishment of Episcopacy to be; and if the Church of England do not shrink (as shrink she will not) from meeting cheerfully the burthen that devolves upon her, neither ought the Government and the Company to be deterred by the expense of it. And since it must animate us to perceive that this process of expiation has already commenced, we wish to direct the attention of our readers to a passage in Mr. Burke's Speech on Mr. Fox's East India Bill, descriptive of our relations with India in 1784. The colouring is high, but the features were there.

"Animated," says he, speaking of the civil servants that went out to India, "with all the avarice of age, and all the impetuosity of youth, they roll in one after another, wave after wave, and there is nothing before the eyes of the natives but an endless, hopeless prospect of new flights of birds of prey and passage, with appetites continually renewing for a food that is continually wasting. With us are no retributory superstitions, by which a foundation of charity compensates, through ages, to

the poor, for the rapine and injustice of a day. With us no pride erects stately monuments which repair the mischiefs which pride had produced, and which adorn a country out of its own spoils. England has erected no churches, no hospitals, no palaces, no schools;—England has made no bridges, made no high-roads, cut no navigations, dug out no reservoirs. Every other conqueror of every other description has left some monument, either of state or beneficence, behind him. Were we to be driven out of India this day, nothing would remain to tell that it had been possessed, during the inglorious period of our dominion, by any thing better than the ourang-outang or the tiger.”

When we have reflected upon the features of this startling picture, and compared it with that which the same relations exhibit at the present day, what a wonderful and delightful alteration will appear! how many of its worst features have been expunged or altered, how greatly the harshness even of those which remain, has been softened! It is not for us to speak of the superior education and enlarged views of those who now hold office in India, the palaces that have been built, the bridges, the roads, and the reservoirs which have been formed, but we can point to the churches which have been reared, the schools which have been endowed, and, what it never entered into the imagination of Mr. Burke to conceive, the College which has lately arisen on the banks of the Ganges, entirely for missionary purposes and for Indian conversions; and all this too by funds not wrung hardly from the impure sources of pride or superstition, but chiefly the spontaneous offering of Christian charity, collected in pounds and shillings from the people of this country. It is in the fervent hope that all these may be multiplied and extended, and usefully directed, that we advocate this cause; and if it should be the will of Heaven that the British power should one day be expelled from India, we trust that, among other monuments of state or benevolence, indicating the characters of those who had reigned in it, there will always be found in the wide diffusion of the Christian name, and in the calm operation of the Christian precepts, the imperishable traces of many a holy and venerable man, of whom, like Bishop Heber, it may be said, “how beautiful are the feet of those which bring glad tidings of good peace.”

* * * *We have been prevented from inserting a Report of Law Proceedings relative to the Church in the present Number, but it will be given in the next.*

STATE OF THE DIOCESES
IN
ENGLAND AND WALES,

FROM OCTOBER TO DECEMBER, INCLUSIVE.

CANTERBURY.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. T. Wood to the Vicarage of Ashford ; Patrons, the Dean and Chapter of Rochester.

The Rev. William Bennett, Rector of St. George's, Canterbury, to the Vicarage of Milton, Kent ; Patrons, the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury.

MARRIED.

At Folkestone, Wyndham Knatchbull, D.D. late Fellow of All Souls' College and Laudian Professor of Arabic in the University of Oxford, and Rector of Smeeth with Adlington, in Kent, to Anna Maria Elizabeth, eldest daughter of Henry Dawkins, Esq.

DECEASED.

At the Vicarage of Milton, the Rev. John Yeates.

The Rev. James Bond, 52 years Vicar of Ashford, Kent.

YORK.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. Henry Venn, M. A. Fellow of Queen's College, Cambridge, to the perpetual Curacy of Drypool, near Hull ; Patron, W. Wilberforce, Esq.

The Rev. W. A. Alderson, of Everingham, to the Living of Seaton Ross, in the East Riding of Yorkshire ; Patron, M. Constable Maxwell, Esq.

The Rev. John Barber, A. M. of St. John's College, Cambridge, and Curate of the Old Church, Macclesfield, Cheshire, to the Perpetual Curacy of Wilsden, in the parish of Bradford ; Patron, the Rev. Henry Heap, Vicar of Bradford.

The Rev. A. Smith to be Curate of Knottingley.

MARRIED.

At Sowerby, near Thirsk, the Rev. Thomas Cautley, to Mary Ann Priscilla, second daughter of the late Rev. Francis Henson, Rector of South Kilvington, Yorkshire.

DECEASED.

The Rev. J. W. Sinclair, Vicar of Hutton Bushel, near Scarborough, and Chaplain to Vicount Downe.

At the Friary, in Newark-upon-Trent, aged 73, the Rev. Wm. Rastall, M. A. Rector of Thorpe, Nottinghamshire.

At Hotham, in his 86th year, the Rev. James Stillingfleet, M. A. Rector of that place.

LONDON.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. George William Curtis, M. A. to the Rectory of Winnington, Essex ; Patron, the Lord Bishop.

The Rev. J. E. Tyler, B. D. and Fellow of Oriol College, Oxford, to the Rectory of St. Giles's in the Fields, London ; Patron, the Lord Chancellor.

The Rev. Thomas Atwood, M. A. to the Perpetual Curacy of the Hamlet of Hammersmith ; Patron, the Lord Bishop.

The Rev. Rich. Wager Allix, B. D. Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, to the Rectory of Great Warley, Essex ; Patrons, the Master and Fellows of that Society.

MARRIED.

At Mary-la-Bonne Church, the Rev. Henry Glyn, M. A. Vicar of Henham,

Essex, to Elizabeth, only daughter of the late Joseph Smith, Esq. of Shortgrove, in the same county.

At the Parish Church of St. Mary-labonne, the Rev. Geo. M. Musgrave, M.A. of Brasenose College, Oxford, elder son of Geo. Musgrave, Esq. of Apsley End, Shillington, Bedfordshire, and Borden Hall, Kent; to Charlotte Emily, youngest daughter of Thomas Oakes, Esq. of Upper Seymour-street, Portman-square.

DECEASED.

At Halstead, in Essex, aged 82, the Rev. John Manistre, M. A. Rector of Stower-Provost *cum* Todbere, in the county of Dorset, and formerly Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. B. A. 1769, M. A. 1772. The Rectory is in the patronage of the Provost and Fellows of that society.

The Rev. J. D. Wainwright, of Sturmer Rectory, Essex.

At Hammersmith, aged 67, the Rev. Thomas Stephen Atwood, M.A. of Meriton College, Oxford (which Degree he took Dec. 13, 1786), Rector of Buckworth and Morborne, in the county of Huntingdon, and upwards of 38 years Minister of the Hamlet of Hammersmith.

DURHAM.

MARRIED.

At the Collegiate Church, Ripon, the Rev. Charles Bury, B. A. of Redmarshall, in the county of Durham, to Eliza Blackwell, eldest daughter of John Howard, Esq. of Ripon.

DECEASED.

At Stagshaw Close House, Northumberland, aged 87, the Rev. John Thompson, Vicar of Warden.

WINCHESTER.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. R. Rowe to the Vicarage of Aisterton, Somersetshire; Patrons, the Dean and Chapter of Winchester.

The Rev. Dr. Cockayne to the Rectory of Dogmersfield, Hants; Patroness, Lady Fildmay.

The Rev. Mr. Riddle to the Living of Easton, near Winchester; Patron, the Lord Bishop.

The Rev. Thomas Westcombe, M. A. Minor Canon of Winchester, to the Vicarage of Preston Candover, Hants; Patrons, the Dean and Chapter of Winchester.

The Rev. Thomas Cooke Kemp, to the Living of East Meon, Hants; Patron, the Lord Bishop.

The Rev. J. Hodges, Vicar of Twyford, to the Rectory of Chilcomb, Hants.

ORDAINED.

By the Lord Bishop, at his Castle at Farnham, on the 24th December.

DEACONS.

Frederick Harry Pare, M. A. Christ Church, Oxford.

Henry Legge, B. A. Christ Church, Oxford.

Wm. Foster, B. A. Trinity College, Cambridge.

Henry Burgess, B. A. Trinity College, Cambridge.

PRIESTS.

William Thomas Blenkinsop, B. A. St. Alban Hall, Oxford.

Proby John Ferrers, B. A. Oriel College, Oxford.

Henry Thompson, M. A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

Charles Lyne, St. John's College, Cambridge.

Samuel Best, B. A. King's College, Cambridge.

MARRIED.

At Richmond, the Hon. and Rev. Baptist Noel, to Miss Baillie, eldest daughter of the late Peter Baillie, Esq. of Dochfour.

At Bungay, the Rev. Gilbert Gilbert, M. A. of Wadham College, Oxford, and of Richmond, Surrey, to Hannah, eldest daughter of Richard Mann, Esq. of Bungay.

DECEASED.

The Rev. Henry Inglis, D. D. Rector of Easton, Hants, and of Hardress *cum* Stelling, Kent, aged 77. Dr. Inglis held successively the Head Mastership of Macclesfield and of Rugby Schools.

At Guildford, aged 64, the Rev. T. Docker, Vicar of Eastmeon, and of Froxfield, Wilts.

Aged 75, the Rev. Wm. Gordon, Rector of Chilcombe, near Winchester.

The Rev. H. H. Champain, late Curate of Winchfield, Hants.

At Southampton, the Rev. J. Burton Phillipson, many years a resident of that city.

The Rev. Richard Bartholomew, Rector of Dunsfold, Surrey.

BATH AND WELLS.**PREFERRED.**

The Rev. Edward Swatman, M. A. to the Vicarage of Dulverton; Patrons, the Dean and Chapter of Wells.

The Rev. William Baker Bere, B. A. of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, to the perpetual and augmented Curacy of Upton, Somerset; Patron, T. Hellings, Esq. Tiverton.

The Rev. E. Wilson, B. A. Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, to the Curacy of St. Michael's, Bath.

The Rev. Wm. Wood, M. A. to the Rectory of Staplegrove; Patron, Vincent Stuckey, Esq.

The Rev. Samuel Blackhall, B. D. Rector of North Cadbury, and late Tutor of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, to a Prebend in Wells Cathedral; Patron, the Lord Bishop.

ORDAINED.

By the Lord Bishop, in Wells Cathedral, on Sunday Nov. 5.

DEACONS.

William Tierney Elton, B. A. Worcester College, Oxford.

Thomas Riddell, B. A. St. Edmund Hall, Oxford.

Francis Charles Alderman, B. A. Exeter College, Oxford.

William Dann Harrison, B. A. Worcester College, Oxford.

Matthew Robert Scott, B. A. Exeter College, Oxford.

Henry Taylor, B. A. Worcester College, Oxford.

Charles Geo. Fred. Vinck, B. A. Magdalen Hall, Oxford.

James Henshaw Gregg, B. A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

William Le Lievre, B. A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

John Rawes, B. A. Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.

Hugh Speke, B. A. Emmanuel College, Cambridge.

William North, B. A. Clare Hall, Cambridge.

Robert Allwood, B. A. Caius College, Cambridge.

PRIESTS.

James Galloway, M. A. Exeter College, Oxford.

Edward Browne Everard, B. A. Balliol College, Oxford.

William Louth, B. A. Christ Church, Oxford.

Simeon Lloyd Pope, B. A. Trinity College, Oxford.

James Anthony Savage, B. A. Trinity College, Oxford.

William George Sawyer, B. A. Balliol College, Oxford.

Edward Bower, B. A. Jesus College, Cambridge.

John Coombes Collins, B. A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

William Quelkett, B. A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

On Sunday, December 31.

DEACONS.

George Baker, B. A. Wadham College, Oxford.

Edward Nares Henning, B. A. Worcester College, Oxford.

Thomas Hope, B. A. University College, Cambridge.

Caleb Rickett, B. A. St. Peter's College, Cambridge.

Henry Penneck, B. A. St. Peter's College, Cambridge.

PRIESTS.

John Barnaby Lewis, B. A. St. Alban Hall, Oxford.

William Jefferys Allen, B. A. Pembroke College, Cambridge.

G. Warwick Bamfylde Daniell, B. A. Caius College, Cambridge.

Henry Peter Daniell, B. A. Trinity College, Cambridge.

Thomas Earle Pipon, B. A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

William Wickenden, B. A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

Reuben Spry Rendle, B. A. Jesus College, Cambridge.

MARRIED.

At Richmond, Yorkshire, the Rev. D. Tremlett, Rector of Rodney Stoke, near Wells, to Isabella Mary, youngest daughter of the late Thomas Simpson, Esq.

At Kensington Church, by the Rev. Gilbert Alder, B. C. L. the Rev. W. Gunning, L. C. L. Chaplain of Particulars, Bath, to Sarah Anne, eldest daughter of Samuel Hutchins, Esq. of Earl's Court, Kensington.

The Rev. John G. Bowen, of Compton Bishop, to Maria, youngest daughter of the late J. Giles, Esq.

The Rev. Theophilus Biddulph, M. A. Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, to Catherine, eldest daughter of John Lindon, Esq. of Weston Court, Somerset.

DECEASED.

At Newton St. Loe, the Rev. George Hawkins, M. A. Fellow of Corpus Christi College.

At the Vicarage, Wedmore, aged 60, the Rev. J. Richards, M.A. Vicar of Wedmore, Somerset.

BRISTOL.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. Thomas Whitfield, B. D. Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford, to the Living of Winterbourne, Gloucestershire; Patrons, the President and Fellows of St. John's College.

The Rev. William Oldfield Bartlett, M. A. of Merton College, Oxford, to the Vicarage of Canford Magna, with the Chapel of Kingston annexed; Patron, George Tito Brice, Esq.

ORDAINED.

By the Lord Bishop, in the Chapel of Christ College, Cambridge, on Sunday, the 17th December.

DEACONS.

Carr John Glynn, B.A. Christ Church, Oxford.

William Samler Hadley, B.A. Queen's College, Oxford.

Charles Woolls, B.A. Pembroke College, Oxford.

Charles Dade, B.A. Caius College, Cambridge.

Henry Arlett, B.A. Pembroke College, Cambridge. *By Let. Dim. from the Bishop of Ely.*

John Day, B.A. Exeter College, Oxford.

Edmund John Senkler, B.A. Caius College, Cambridge. *By Let. Dim. from the Bishop of Norwich.*

Villiers Hen. Plantagenet Somerset, B.A. Christ Church, Oxford. *By Let. Dim. from the Bishop of Llandaff.*

PRIESTS.

George Maxwell, B.A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

Thomas James Dallin, B.A. Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.

Richard Thomas Lancaster, M.A. Exeter College, Oxford. *By Let. Dim. from the Bishop of Rochester.*

Edward Richard Benyon, B.A. St. John's College, Cambridge. *By Let. Dim. from the Bishop of Norwich.*

MARRIED.

At Kingston Magna, Dorsetshire, the Rev. Thomas Manners-Sutton, Rector of

Great Chart, Kent, and Chaplain to Earl Brownlow, to Lucy Sarah, only child of the Rev. H. S. Mortimer, Rector of Kingston Magna.

DECEASED.

At Wimborne Minster, Dorsetshire, aged 82, the Rev. J. Baskett, senior Minister of the Collegiate Church.

CARLISLE.

DECEASED.

At Kirkandrews upon Esk, in his 70th year, after a few days' illness, the Rev. John Nichols.

CHESTER.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. J. Topping, M. A. Curate and Surrogate of Warrington, to the Vicarage of Leigh; Patron, the Right Hon. Lord Lilford.

The Rev. Thomas Lowe, Minister of Becconsal, to be Curate and Surrogate of the Parish Church of Warrington.

The Rev. Richard Jones, to the Perpetual Curacy of Little Leigh, Cheshire; Patron, the Rev. George Henry Webber, Vicar of Great Budworth.

The Rev. G. B. Blomfield, B. A. of Christ College, Cambridge, to the living of Tattenhall, near Chester.

The Rev. J. Streynsham Master, M.A. of Balliol College, Oxford, to the Rectory of Chorley; Patroness, Mrs. Master.

The Rev. T. Burkett, B. A. to the Curacy of the New Church, Chorley.

The Ven. John Headlam, M.A. Rector of Wycliffe, Yorkshire, to the Archdeaconry of Richmond.

DECEASED.

At the Rectory-house, Hallaton, Leicestershire, the Rev. John Wilson, formerly one of the Chaplains of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Head Master of the Grammar School, at Bolton-le-Moor. He proceeded to the Degree of M. A. in 1795.

At Dinglehead, Toxteth Park, near Liverpool, the Rev. John Yates.

CHICHESTER.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. R. Ridsdale, M. A. one of the Senior Fellows of Clarehall, Cambridge, to the Vicarage of Kirdford, near Petworth, Sussex; Patron, the Right Hon. the Earl of Egremont.

ORDAINED.

By the Lord Bishop, in the Cathedral Church, on the 21st December.

DEACONS.

George Wells, B.A. Magdalen College, Oxford.

William Sergison, B.A. Brasenose College, Oxford.

Henry Fearon, B.A. Emmanuel College, Cambridge.

Cecil James Green, B.A. Pembroke College, Cambridge.

John Littler, M.A. St. Peter's College, Cambridge.

Charles Hardy, B.A. Christ's College, Cambridge.

PRIESTS.

David Robinson, M.A. Queen's College, Oxford.

Henry John Ellman, S.C.L. Wadham College, Oxford.

Thomas Hornby, B.A. Christ Church, Oxford.

Nath. Best, B.A. Balliol College, Oxford.

Thomas Moore Foskett, B.A. Exeter College, Oxford.

James P. Rhoades, B.A. Wadham College, Oxford.

Richard Green, B.A. Emmanuel College, Cambridge.

John W. H. Marshall, B.A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

Edward Langdale, B.A. Jesus College, Cambridge.

William Hall, St. Peter's College, Cambridge.

MARRIED.

At Brede, Sussex, the Rev. John Geo. Ash, M.A. of Queen's College, Cambridge, to Caroline Selby, second daughter of the Rev. Robert Hele Selby Hele, Rector of Brede.

At Heathfield, Sussex, the Rev. E. Raynes, of Belmonte, Easttholy, to Mary, only daughter of the late Edward Fuller, Esq. of Heathfield.

ST. DAVID'S.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. W. Morgan, M.A. Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, and Curate of Maidenhead, Berks, to the Vicarage of Llandovery, and to the Rural Deanery of Llangadoch, in the county of Carmarthen; Patron, the Lord Bishop.

The Rev. Daniel Evans, to the Vicarage of Llanofaufawr, with the Three Chapels annexed, Brecon; Patron, the Lord Bishop.

The Rev. Charles Thorp, B.D. of University College, Oxford, and formerly Fellow of that Society, to the Prebend of Llandrindod, in the Collegiate Church of Brecon; Patron, the Lord Bishop.

The Rev. T. Davies, Curate of Ystradgynlais, Breconshire, to the Perpetual Curacy of Coelbron Chapel, in the same county; Patron, the Rev. F. Gough, of Yniscedwyn House.

The Rev. E. Pendrill, Curate of Killabeyll, to the Perpetual Curacy of Llanquick, Glamorganshire; Patroness, Mrs. Bassett.

The Rev. Francis Baker, to the Rectory of Wylve; Patron, the Earl of Pembroke.

MARRIED.

The Rev. James Thomas, B.A. of Pembroke College, Oxford, and Head Master of Haverfordwest Grammar School, to Miss Carver, eldest daughter of Daniel Carver, Esq. of Wenallt, Carmarthenshire.

DECEASED.

The Rev. David Rogers, of Penygraig, near Newcastle Emlyn; Carmarthenshire.

ELY.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. Francis Russell Hall, B.D. Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, to the Rectory of Fulbourn, St. Vigor's, Cambridgeshire; Patrons, the Master and Fellows of that Society.

The Rev. W. Mair, M.A. of Trinity College, Cambridge, to the Vicarage of Fulbourn, All Saints', Cambridgeshire.

The Rev. Geo. Jarvis, to the Vicarage of Tuttington, Norwich; Patron, the Lord Bishop of Ely.

ORDAINED.

Sunday, Nov. 5, by the Lord Bishop of Ely.

DEACONS.

John Birkett, M.A. Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.

James Bowstead, B.A. Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.

Charles Henry Maturin, M.A. Fellow of King's College, Cambridge.

William Jones, B.A. Emmanuel College, Cambridge.

Frederick Smith, B.A. St. Peter's College, Cambridge.

Fitzgerald Wintour, B.A. Magdalen College, Cambridge.

George H. Eyre, B.A. Pembroke College, Cambridge. *By Let. Dim. from the Archbishop of York.*

Edward Medley, Queen's Coll. Cambridge. *By Let. Dim. from the Bishop of Lincoln.*

George A. Ward, Brasenose College, Oxford. *By Let. Dim. from the Bishop of Rochester.*

PRIESTS.

Robert Cory, M.A. Fellow of Emmanuel College, Cambridge.

J. F. Isaacson, B.A. Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.

Henry John Rose, M.A. Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.

Sydney Gedge, B.A. Fellow of Catharine Hall, Cambridge.

William Henry Walker, M.A. Fellow of Queen's College, Cambridge.

William Crawley, B.A. Fellow of Magdalen College, Cambridge.

Stephen Davies, S.C.L. Queen's College, Cambridge.

David Morton, B.A. Trinity College, Cambridge. *By Let. Dim. from the Bishop of London.*

Wm. Brown James, B.A. Jesus College, Cambridge. *By Let. Dim. from the Bishop of Rochester.*

MARRIED.

At Astbury, the Rev. F. R. Hall, Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and Rector of Fulbourn St. Vigor's, in that county, to Frances, eldest daughter of the late Richard Martin, Alderman, of Congleton, in the county of Chester.

EXETER.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. Reginald Chandos Pole, M.A. of St. Mary Hall, Oxford, and Chaplain to the Countess of St. Germans, to hold the Rectory of Mary Tavy, in the county of Devon, on the presentation of John Buller, Esq. of Morval, in the county of Cornwall, together with the Rectory of Stevrocke, by dispensation.

The Rev. Orlando Hamlyn Williams, B.A. of Balliol College, Oxford, to the Rectory of Clavelleigh, otherwise Clovelly, Devon.

MARRIED.

The Rev. Samuel Henry Duntze, B.A. of Brasenose College, Oxford, eldest son of James Duntze, Esq. of Hensley, near Tiverton, to Frances Palmer, fourth daughter of the Very Rev. the Dean of Cashel.

The Rev. Thomas Tanner, Vicar of Burliscombe, Devon, to Miss Mary Baily,

of Haywood Cottage, Wellington, Somerset.

DECEASED.

At Leversdon House, Thurlaxton, near Taunton, in the 37th year of his age, the Rev. R. Sayer.

In Queen-square, London, the Rev. Dr. William Forord Michell, Rector of St. Martin's, Looe, Cornwall, and of Oriel College, Oxford; M.A. July 13, 1790; B.D. and D.D. June 28, 1810.

At Exeter, the Rev. Thomas Neucatre, Rector of Wordwell, near Bury, Suffolk; the Living is in the gift of R. Benyon De Beauvoir, Esq.

GLOUCESTER.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. F. Close, to the Perpetual Curacy of Cheltenham, void by the death of the Rev. C. Jervis.

The Rev. John Kempthorne, B.D. to the Rectory of St. Michael, Gloucester; Patron, the Lord Chancellor.

ORDAINED.

On Sunday, December 17, by the Lord Bishop.

DEACONS.

John Marshall Collard, B.A. Exeter College, Oxford.

Watson Buller Pole, B.A. Balliol College, Oxford.

John Missing, B.A. Magdalen Hall, Oxford.

Henry Revell Revell, B.A. Catharine Hall, Cambridge.

PRIESTS.

Thomas Evans, B.A. Oriel College, Oxford.

Henry Pruett, B.A. Oriel College, Oxford.

Edward Palling, B.A. Queen's College, Oxford.

George Thompson, B.A. Queen's College, Oxford.

Arthur Turner, B.A. Exeter College, Oxford.

Orlando Hamlyn Williams, B.A. Balliol College, Oxford.

Samuel Lane, B.A. Exeter College, Oxford.

Richard Shutt, B.A. Emmanuel College, Cambridge.

George Cornwall, Queen's College, Cambridge.

Samuel Rowe, B.A. Jesus College, Cambridge.

256 *Dioceses of Hereford—Lichfield and Coventry—Lincoln.*

DECEASED.

At Stinchcombe, Gloucestershire, in his 82d year, the Rev. Richard Lockey.

The Rev. Charles Jervis, M.A. Chaplain to his Royal Highness the Duke of Cambridge, Rector of Luddenham, Kent, and Perpetual Curate of Cheltenham, aged 44.

HEREFORD.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. W. Bowen, of Kentchurch, to the Perpetual Curacy of Kenderchurch, Herefordshire; Patron, the Earl of Oxford.

LICHFIELD AND COVENTRY.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. William H. C. Lloyd, M.A. and Scholar of Jesus College, Oxford, to the Rectory of Norbury, and likewise to the Vicarage of Ronton, both in the county of Stafford; Patron, Lord Viscount Anson.

The Rev. J. Baylie, to the Chapelry of Bloxwich, Walsall; Patron, (by lapse) the Lord Bishop.

The Rev. W. T. Birds, B.A. to the Rectory of Preston on the Wildmoors, Salop; Patrons, the Trustees of Preston Hospital.

The Rev. W. Davison, M.A. to the Deanery or Peculiar of Hartington; Patrons, the Trustees under the will of the late Sir Hugh Bateman.

The Rev. W. M. Ward, B.A. to the Vicarage of Hartington, Derbyshire; Patron, the Duke of Devonshire.

MARRIED.

The Rev. Charles Thomas Dawes, of Adbaston, Staffordshire, to M. H. Sherwood, eldest daughter of H. Sherwood, Esq. of Wick Episcopi.

The Rev. Robert Downs, Vicar of Leamington, Warwickshire, to Philadelphia, youngest daughter of the late J. T. H. Hopper, Esq. of Wilton Castle, Durham.

DECEASED.

At Hodnett Rectory, Salop, the Rev. Geo. Allanson, Prebendary of Ripon, Yorkshire.

At High Offley, Staffordshire, aged 75, the Rev. Thomas Harding, Vicar of Adbaston and Ranton, and 35 years Curate of High Offley.

In his 68th year, the Rev. George Bonney, M.A. Vicar of Sandon, Staffordshire, and formerly Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge.

LINCOLN.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. Henry Atlay, M.A. domestic Chaplain to the Marquess of Exeter, and late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, to hold the Rectory of Tinwell, in the county of Rutland, by Dispensation, with the Rectory of Great Ponton, in the county of Lincoln; Patron of the latter living, the Rev. Wm. Potchett, M.A. Prebendary of North Grantham.

The Rev. S. Martin, one of the Vicars of Lincoln Cathedral, to the Rectory of St. Mary Magdalen (or Chequer Church), and to the Vicarage of St. Nicolas, both in that city.

The Rev. James Linton, M.A. Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, to the Curacy of Hemingford Grey.

The Rev. C. W. Hughes, B.A. to the Perpetual Curacy of the Chapel of St. John the Evangelist, at Lacey Green, Bucks.

The Rev. G. Woodcock, M.A. of Trinity College, to the Rectory of Caythorpe, Lincolnshire.

The Rev. Mr. Gape, son of the Rev. James Carpenter Gape, of St. Alban's, to the Vicarage of Sibsey, Lincolnshire; Patron, the King.

ORDAINED.

By the Lord Bishop, at Buckden, on Sunday the 24th of September.

DEACONS.

David Fulford Harridge, B.A. Queen's College, Cambridge.

Henry Margetts, M.A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

George Pocock, S.C.L. Trinity Hall, Cambridge.

Woolley Spencer, B.A. Christ College, Cambridge.

Richard Whitelock, B.A. Lincoln College, Oxford.

Henry Reginald Yorke, B.A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

George Harrison, B.A. Lincoln College, Oxford.

William Gray. *Literate.*

Henry John Branson, B.A. Caius College, Cambridge. *By Let. Dim. from the Archbishop of York.*

Edward Cox, B.A. Trinity College, Cambridge. *By Let. Dim. from the Bishop of Exeter.*

PRIESTS.

George Atkinson, B.A. Queen's College, Cambridge.

James Beaven, B.A. St. Edmund Hall, Oxford.

John Peacock Byde, B.A. Pembroke Hall, Cambridge.

Edmund Fisher, M.A. Fellow of St. Peter's College, Cambridge.

John Fry, B.A. Trinity College, Cambridge.

Thomas Harrison, B.A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

Charles William Hughes, B.A. Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.

Augustus Davies Ions, St. John's College, Cambridge.

John Mandell, B.A. Catharine Hall, Cambridge.

George Morley, Catharine Hall, Cambridge.

William Peart, B.A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

Joseph Place, B.A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

Thomas Sanderson, B.A. Magdalen Hall, Oxford.

Thomas Trocke, M.A. Pembroke Hall, Cambridge.

James Taylor Wareing, B.A. Exeter College, Oxford.

Sunday, December 17th.

DEACONS.

Robert B. Buckle, B.A. Fellow of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge.

William Jennings Hamilton, B.A. Pembroke College, Oxford.

Richard Reade, B.A. Caius College, Cambridge.

Thomas Reamington, B.A. Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

Henry Davis Ward, B.A. Trinity College, Cambridge.

William Balfour Winning, M.A. Trinity College, Cambridge.

PRIESTS.

Alexander Joseph Lyon Cavie, B.A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

John Frederic Dawson, S.C.L. Trinity College, Cambridge.

Robert Wade Gery, B.A. Emmanuel College, Cambridge.

Matthew Wilson, B.A. Catharine Hall, Cambridge.

MARRIED.

At St. George's, Hanover-square, the Rev. Sir Francis Whichcote, Bart. of Aswarby, Lincolnshire, to Eliza, only daughter of Robert Bree, M.D. F.R.S. of George Street, Hanover-square.

At Biddenham, Bedfordshire, the Rev. G. H. Bowers, Chaplain to the Gaol,

NO. I.—JAN. 1827.

and Perpetual Curate of Elstow, to Miss Addington, of the former place.

At Boston, the Rev. Joseph Hugill, of Burton Coggles, near Corby, Lincolnshire, to Miss Mary Walker, of Boston, only daughter of the late John Walker, Esq. of Sheffield.

The Rev. John Longhurst, B.A. of Kirkby Mallory, Leicestershire, to Miss Ellis.

At Hughendon, the Rev. Frederick Vincent, M.A. of Brasenose College, to Louisa, second daughter of John Norris, Esq. of Hughendon House, Bucks.

At Fillingham, Lincolnshire, the Rev. C. Roberts, of Coningsby, to Elizabeth, younger daughter of the late Rev. G. Kelly, Prebendary of York.

At All Saints', Hertford, the Rev. R. Ridsdale, M.A. Fellow of Clare Hall, Cambridge, to Audrey Harriet, daughter of the Right Hon. Lord John Townshend.

The Rev. Thomas Morell, Resident and Theological Tutor of Wymondley College, Herts, to Mrs. S. Newton, widow of the late Rev. S. Newton, of Witham.

DECEASED.

At Eton, the Rev. William Cooke, aged 77.

At Ab Kettleby, aged 57, the Rev. James Bingham Copesteaks, Vicar of that place, and of Calverton, near Nottingham.

At Weston Underwood, the Rev. John Buchanan, Perpetual Curate of that place, and Vicar of North Grinstead, Yorkshire.

In Bath, the Rev. Joseph Babington, M.A. and M.D. fourth son of the late Thomas Babington, Esq. of Rothley Temple, Leicestershire.

Aged 32, the Rev. Thomas Margetts, second son of William Margetts, Esq. of Huntingdon.

The Rev. Daniel Stephen Olivier, aged 71, thirty-six years Rector of Clifton, in Bedfordshire.

NORWICH.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. T. Turton, B.D. Fellow of Catharine Hall, Cambridge, to the Rectories of Gimingham and Trunch; Patrons, the Master and Fellows of that Society.

The Rev. Charles Green, B.A. to the Rectory of Buxhall, Suffolk, and also to the Rectory of Harlston, in the same county.

The Hon. and Rev. Hugh Anthony Rous, A.M. to the Vicarage of Reydon, in Suffolk, and also to the Perpetual

Curacy of Southwold, in the said county; Patron of both Preferments, the Right Hon. John Earl of Stradbroke.

The Rev. Henry Alford, M.A. late Fellow of Wadham College, Oxford, to the Rectory of Ampton, Suffolk; Patron, the Right Hon. Lord Calthorpe.

The Rev. Joseph Parson, M.A. to the Consolidated Rectory of Ashwicken and Leziate, Norfolk; Patron, the Rev. Richard Venables, D.D.

The Rev. C. Day, Vicar of Rushmere, Suffolk, to the Perpetual Curacy of Playford, in the same county.

The Rev. William Browne, B.A. Rector of Marlesford, to the Rectory of Little Glemham, with the Perpetual Curacy of Great Glemham annexed, in Suffolk; and

The Rev. L. R. Brown, M.A. to the Rectory of Saxmundham, Suffolk; Patron to both Livings, D. L. North, Esq. of Little Glemham Hall.

ORDAINED.

Sunday, Oct. 15, by the Lord Bishop, in the Cathedral.

DEACONS.

William Brett, B.A. Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.

William Browne, B.A. Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge.

James Carver, B.A. Jesus College, Cambridge.

Henry Clinton, B.A. Fellow of Caius College, Cambridge.

Edward Cole, B.A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

Thomas Currie, B.A. Emmanuel College, Cambridge.

Richard Day, B.A. Caius College, Cambridge.

Charles John Gooch, B.A. Christ Church, Oxford.

William Hall, St. Peter's College, Cambridge.

Thomas Hulton, B.A. Caius College, Cambridge.

Edward Martin, M.A. Trinity College, Dublin.

Edward Millard, B.A. Exeter College, Oxford.

William Stamer, B.A. Trinity College, Dublin.

William Steggall, B.A. Jesus College, Cambridge.

John Hampden Thelwall, M.A. Trinity College, Cambridge.

William Hamilton Turner, B.A. Pembroke Hall, Cambridge.

Nathaniel Wodehouse, B.A. Merton College, Oxford.

PRIESTS.

Robert Jervis Coke Alderson, B.A. Exeter College, Oxford.

William Ayerst, B.A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

John George Carless, B.A. Jesus College, Cambridge.

William Lloyd Gibbon, B.A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

Robert Hawthorn, St. Peter's College, Cambridge.

Charles Holloway, B.A. Queen's College, Cambridge.

Henry Lewin, B.A. Trinity College, Cambridge.

Henry Samuel Livins, M.A. Trinity College, Cambridge.

John May, B.A. Exeter College, Oxford.

Thomas Nunn, B.A. Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge.

William Orger, B.A. St. Edmund Hall, Oxford.

George Ranking, S.C.L. Christ College, Cambridge.

John Francis Treadway, Pembroke Hall, Cambridge.

Charles Walter Winter, B.A. Clare Hall, Cambridge.

MARRIED.

At Troston, Suffolk, the Rev. Walter John Spring Casborne, M.A. of New House, Pakenham, to Anne, daughter of the late Capel Loft, Esq. of Troston Hall.

The Rev. G. Steward, of Woodbastwick, to Miss C. H. August, daughter of the late Mr. Wm. August, of Great Yarmouth.

The Rev. Thomas Corbould, of Upton, to Hannah, daughter of John Francis, Esq. of Twyford.

DECEASED.

Aged 27, the Rev. Wm. W. Jardine, eldest son of J. K. Jardine, Esq. of Wiscoe, Suffolk.

At Saxmundham, aged 72, the Rev. Wm. Brown, Rector of that parish and Little Glemham, and Perpetual Curate of Great Glemham.

At Sterton, Norfolk, the Rev. Wm. Whitear, M.A. Rector of that parish, and formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge; B.A. 1800; M.A. 1803. The Rectory of Sterton is in the nomination of the Duke of Norfolk, but must be given to a foundation Fellow of St. John's College.

At Runceton, the Rev. W. Drew, Rector of Sandringham and Babingley.

The Rev. William Davy, of Hautbois, Vicar of Tuttington, Norfolk.

At Metton Parsonage, the Rev. Philip Hudson, Rector of Felbrigg and Metton.

Suddenly, while on a visit at Assington Hall, the Rev. John Hallward, Vicar of Assington, Suffolk.

OXFORD.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. A. C. Price, M.A. Fellow of New College, Oxford, to the Vicarage of Chesterton, Oxfordshire; Patrons, the Warden and Fellows of that Society.

The Rev. Rd. Skillicorne Skillicorne, to the Rectory of Salford, on his own petition, as the Patron thereof.

The Rev. H. Davis, M.A. to the Perpetual Curacy of Barfield St. Michael, Oxfordshire; Patron, J. Hall, Esq.

The Rev. Thomas Tunstall Haverfield, B.D. Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, to the Rectory of Godington, in that county; Patrons, the President, Fellows and Scholars of that Society.

The Rev. W. T. Hopkins, M.A. of Pembroke College, Oxford, to the Rectory of Nuffield, Oxfordshire; Patrons, Rev. R. B. Fisher, and Rev. W. T. Hopkins.

The Hon. and Rev. Henry Alfred Napier, M.A. of Christ Church, Oxford, to the Rectory of Swyncombe, in that county; Patron, the King.

ORDAINED.

Sunday, December 21.

In Christ Church Cathedral, by the most Rev. his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Cashel (For the Hon. and Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of this Diocese, in consequence of the severe indisposition of his Lordship).

DEACONS.

Hugh Pollard Willoughby, B.A. Exeter College.

William Hayward Cox, B.A. Pembroke College.

Frederic Francis Edwardes, M.A. Fellow of Corpus Christi College.

Charles Parker Price, B.A. Pembroke College.

Charles Maybery, B.A. Jesus College.

James Matthews, B.A. Wadham College.

Thomas Vere Bayne, M.A. Jesus College.

Henry Brislow Wilson, B.A. Fellow of St. John's College.

Thomas Pitman, B.A. Wadham College.

Edward Kitson, B.A. Fellow of Balliol College.

David Aitchison, M.A. Queen's College.

James Garbett, M.A. Fellow of Brasenose College.

John Cecil Hall, S.C.L. Christ Church.

Henry Legge, S.C.L. Fellow of All Souls' College.

Henry Thorpe, B.A. Fellow of St. John's College.

George Moberley, B.A. Fellow of Balliol College.

Richard Leonard Adams, M.A. Christ Church.

PRIESTS.

Theophilus Biddulph, M.A. Fellow of Corpus Christi College.

Thomas Shaw Helliier, M.A.

Robert Sherson, B.A.

Henry Gregory, B.A.

Robert Alder Thorpe, M.A. Fellow of Corpus Christi College.

Robert Duncombe Warner, M.A.

Thomas Arthur Powys, B.A. Fellow of St. John's College.

Matthew Hughes George Bucle, B.A. Wadham College.

Robert Hussey, B.A. Christ Church.

James Temple Mansel, B.A. Christ Church.

Edward John Wingfield, B.A. Christ Church.

Robert Appleton, B.A. Leafield.

William Francis Harrison, B.A. Magdalen College.

Charles Bathurst, S.C.L. Fellow of All Souls' College.

John William Lockwood, M.A. Christ Church.

James Hughes, B.A. Jesus College.

James Hadley, B.A. Wadham College.

William Watson James Augustus Langford, B.A.

MARRIED.

At St. Aldate's Church, by the Rev. Dr. Shuttleworth, Warden of New College, the Rev. James Lupton, Chaplain of Christ Church and New College, to Miss Anne Dry, second daughter of Mr. Thomas Dry, of the city of Oxford.

At Oddington, the Rev. Geo. Elliott Ranken, B.A. of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, to Harriette Anne, youngest daughter of the late Stephen George Church, Esq. R.N.

DECEASED.

On Monday, Dec. 4. Abram Robertson, D.D. F.R.S. Savilian Professor of Astronomy and Radcliffe Observer, aged 75. Dr. Robertson took his Degree of M.A. in 1782, and B.D. and D.D. in 1807. He succeeded Dr. Smith as Savilian Professor of Geometry in 1797, and was elected Savilian Professor of Astronomy, in the room of Dr. Hornsby, in 1810.

Upon the Professorship in Astronomy becoming vacant, the Vice-Chancellor has to signify the same in writing to the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lord Chancellor of Great Britain, the Chancellor of the University, the Bishop of London, the principal Secretary of State, the Chief Justices, the Chief Baron of the Exchequer, and the Dean of the Arches, who are the electors and visitors. These illustrious persons are solemnly conjured by the Founder to seek for the ablest Mathematicians in other countries as well as our own; and, without regard to particular Universities or Nations, to elect those whom they shall deem best qualified for the office. On a transmission of their choice, the person so elected is admitted by the University in Convocation.—The Radcliffe Trustees appoint the *Observer*, who nominates his assistant.

The Rev. James Matthews, B.D. Fellow of St. John's College, aged 49.

The Rev. William Burslem, son of the late Rev. William Burslem, Rector of Hanbury, in the county,

Suddenly, in the 63d year of his age, the Rev. Robert Bertie Broughton Robinson, M.A. of Christ Church, Rector of Waterstock, Oxfordshire, and of Emmington, Bucks. He took his Degree of M.A. May 28, 1789.

At Guernsey, the Rev. Peter Maingy, M.A. formerly Scholar of Pembroke College, and late Curate of Bampton, Oxfordshire.

The Rev. Moses Bartholomew, of Waddington, Oxfordshire.

PETERBOROUGH.

ORDAINED.

By the Lord Bishop in the cathedral, on Thursday, December 21st, being St. Thomas's Day.

DEACONS.

Miles Joseph Berkeley, B.A. Christ College, Cambridge.

Brook George Bridges, B.A. Oriel College, Oxford.

Charles William Chalklen, B.A. Trinity College, Cambridge.

John Henry Fludyer, B.A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

PRIESTS.

Jonathan Doupbrate, B.A. Magdalene Hall, Oxford.

John Giles Powell, B.A. St. Peter's College, Cambridge.

William Stoddart, M.A. Christ College, Cambridge.

MARRIED.

At South Kirkby, Yorkshire, the Rev. Septimus Hodson, of Sharow House, in the same county, and Rector of Thrapston, Northamptonshire, to Margaret, eldest daughter of the late Allen Halford, Esq. of Davenham, in the county of Chester.

The Rev. William Corbett Wilson, Vicar of Bozeat-cum-Stricton, eldest son of the Rev. William Corbett Wilson, Vicar of Hardwicke Priors-cum-Membris, to Elizabeth, daughter of the late William Whitworth, Esq. of Bedford.

ROCHESTER.

MARRIED.

At St. Mary's, Bryanstone Square, London, the Rev. J. J. Saint, M.A. of Brasenose College, Oxford, and of Speldhurst, Kent, to Sophia Heath, youngest daughter of the late M. W. Wilson, Esq.

At Tunbridge, the Rev. Richard Ramsey Warde, M.A. of Brasenose College, Oxford, to Mary, eldest daughter of the late Aretas Akers, Esq.

SALISBURY.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. John Bright, M.A. to the Prebend of Combe and Harnham, with Ruscombe Northbury annexed, in the Cathedral Church; Patron, the Lord Bishop.

The Rev. James Hitchings, Curate of Sunninghill, Berks, to the Vicarage of Wargrave, in the same county; Patron, Lord Braybrooke.

The Rev. George Stone, M.A. to the Vicarage of Longburton, with the Chapel of Holnest, in the county of Dorset.

The Rev. G. R. Orchard, to the Perpetual Curacy of Christ Church, Road, Somersetshire; Patron, the Venerable the Archdeacon of Sarum.

The Rev. John Ward, B.A. Domestic Chaplain to the Marquis of Aylesbury, to

the Vicarage of Great Bedwin, Wilts; Patron, his Lordship.

The Rev. Charles Grey Cotes, B.A. of Christ Church, Oxford, to the Rectory of Stanton St. Quinten; patron, the Earl of Radnor.

The Rev. R. Downes, M.A. Fellow of New College, Oxford, to the Rectory of Berwick St. John, Wilts; Patrons, the Warden and Fellows of that Society.

ORDAINED.

In the Chapel of the Palace at Sarum, Sunday, September 24, by the Lord Bishop.

DEACONS.

Henry Brown, B.A. Queen's College, Oxford.

Anthony Lewis Lambert, B.A. Trinity College, Oxford.

Thomas George Patrick Attwood, B.A. Pembroke College, Oxford.

Edward Beauchamp St. John, B.A. St. Alban Hall, Oxford.

Daniel James Eyre, B.A. Oriel College, Oxford.

Charles Clifton, B.A. Worcester College, Oxford.

William Barrett, B.A. Magdalen College, Oxford.

William Powley, B.A. Jesus College, Cambridge.

Thomas Husband, B.A. Magdalen College, Cambridge.

Henry Wyatt Cottle, B.A. Sydney Sussex College, Cambridge.

William Start, B.A. Trinity College, Cambridge.

William Sykes, B.A. Sydney Sussex College, Cambridge.

Charles Maitland Long, B.A. Trinity College, Cambridge.

PRIESTS.

George James Huddleston, B.A. Merton College, Cambridge.

John Hartland Worgan, M.A. Pembroke College, Oxford.

James Addir Griffith Colpoys, M.A. Exeter College, Oxford.

William Seaton, Queen's College, Cambridge.

Philip Wentworth Buckham, B.A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

John Ward, B.A. Christ College, Cambridge.

MARRIED.

At St. Giles's in-the-Fields, London, the Rev. W. Start, of Telford, in the county

of Wilts, to Louisa, third daughter of John Gurney, Esq. King's Counsel.

The Rev. William Powley, of Newbury, Berks, to Mary Ann, only daughter of William Vicary, Esq. of Exeter.

At Richmond, the Rev. Sam. Paynter, M.A. of Trinity College, Cambridge, Rector of Hatford, Berks, to Eliza, only daughter of Samuel Paynter, Esq. of Richmond.

DECEASED.

At Hare Hatch, aged 48, the Rev. Philip Trant Nind, Vicar of Wargrave, Berks.

WORCESTER.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. John Lane Freer, A.B. of Trinity College, Cambridge, to the Vicarage of Wasperton, in the county of Warwick; Patron, the Rev. John Lucy, Rector of Hampton Lucy, in the same county.

The Rev. Anthony Berwick Lechmere, M.A. to the Vicarage of Eldersfield, Worcestershire; Patron, Sir Anthony Lechmere, of the Rhydd, Bart.

The Rev. Thomas Wilde, M.A. of Christ Church, Oxford, to the Rectory of St. Andrews, Worcester; Patrons, the Dean and Chapter of Worcester.

The Rev. Robert Farquhar Hook, M.A. Student of Christ Church, Oxford, to the Perpetual Curacy of Moseley, Worcestershire; Patron, the very Rev. the Dean of Worcester, in right of his Vicarage of Bromsgrove.

The Hon. and Rev. T. H. Coventry, M.A. to the Rectory of Hill Croome, Worcestershire; Patron, the King.

The Rev. C. H. Parker, M.A. Fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford, to the Rectory of Great Compton, Worcestershire.

The Rev. William Parker, M.A. Fellow of New College, Oxford, to the Rectory of Little Compton, Worcestershire.

ORDAINED.

By the Lord Bishop, December 1st, in the chapel at Hartlebury Castle.

PRIEST.

John Lane Freer, B.A. Trinity College, Cambridge.

MARRIED.

At Severn Stoke, the Rev. Marnaduke Vavasour, M.A. of Brazenose College, Oxford, to Mary Ann, youngest daughter of the Rev. J. F. S. Fleming St. John, one

of the Prebendaries of Worcester Cathedral.

The Rev. Francis Demainbray, Fellow of Pembroke College, Oxford, to Mary, only daughter of the late Francis Findon, Esq. of Shipston-on-Stour.

SCHOOLS AND HOSPITALS.

The Very Rev. James Hook, D.C.L. of St. Mary Hall, Oxford, and Dean of Worcester, to the Mastership of St. Oswald's Hospital, in the suburbs of that city. Patron, for this turn, the King.

The Rev. H. Alford, to the Mastership of the Free Grammar School at Bideford.

The Rev. Thomas Nalder, to be Minister of Queen Elizabeth's Hospital, Donnington, Berks. Patron, the Rev. Winchcombe Henry Howard Hartley.

The Rev. Charles Taylor, B.A. of Brazenose College, Oxford, to the Head Mastership of the Cathedral School, Hereford.

The Rev. J. R. Major, Thetford, B.A. of Trinity College, Cambridge, to the Head Mastership of the Free Grammar School of Wisbech. Patrons, the Town Bailiff and Capital Burgesses of that town.

The Rev. W. H. Chapman, M.A. to be Second Master of Charterhouse School, Cambridge.

CHAPLAINS AND PREACHERS.

The Rev. James Davis, M.A. Vicar of Chepstow, to be one of the Domestic Chaplains to the Dowager Lady Boston.

The Rev. Courtenay Boyle Bruce, of St. Peter's College, Cambridge, to be Domestic Chaplain to his Royal Highness the Duke of York.

The Rev. C. W. Hughes, Perpetual Curate of Lacey Green Chapel, Bucks, to be Domestic Chaplain to his Grace the Duke of Beaufort.

The Rev. Frederick Leicester, B.A. of Queen's College, Oxford, and Vicar of Candover, Salop, to be Domestic Chaplain to the Right Hon. Lord de Tabley.

The Rev. Wm. Mirehouse, M.A. Rector of Colsterworth, Lincoln, to be Domestic Chaplain to her Royal Highness the Princess Sophia.

The Rev. Thomas Henry White, M.A. of University College, Oxford, and Priest

Vicar of Litchfield Cathedral, to be one of the Domestic Chaplains to the Marquis of Downshire.

The Rev. John Horsford, B.A. of Queen's College, Oxford, and Curate of Weymouth and Wyke, to be one of the Domestic Chaplains to the Right Hon. the Earl of Aberdeen.

The Rev. Thomas Henderson, M.A. Student of Christ Church, Oxford, to be Domestic Chaplain to the Right Hon. the Earl of Verulam.

The Rev. John Worgan Dew, Curate of Whitkirk and Roundhay, to be one of the Domestic Chaplains to Lord Viscount Strathallan.

The Rev. William Fowler Holt, M.A. late Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, to be Minister of Laura Chapel, Bath.

PREFERRED.

Church of Ireland.

His Majesty's Letters Patent have passed the Great Seal of Ireland, for promoting the Rev. JOHN BRINKLEY, D.D. to the Bishopric of Cloyne, vacant by the death of Dr. CHARLES M. WARBURTON.

Church of Scotland.

The Rev. R. Buchanan, to the Church and Parish of Gargunnoch.

The Rev. Tho. Cannan, to the Church and Parish of Carsephain.

The Rev. James Maitland, to the Church and Parish of Kells.

The Rev. Wm. Dow, to the Church and Parish of Tonglant.

The Rev. John Lamb, to the Church and Parish of Kirkmaiden.

The Rev. Jacob Richardson, to the Church and Parish of Largs.

The Rev. James Walker, to the Church and Parish of Muthil.

The Rev. Wm. Menzies, to the Church and Parish of Keir.

The Rev. Mr. Dunn, to the Church and Parish of Slaines.

The Rev. Duncan Macfarlane, to the Parochial Chapel of Anderton, in the Barony Parish of Glasgow.

The Rev. J. J. Macfarlane, to the Chapel of Arbroath.

New South Wales.

The Rev. C. P. N. Wilton, M.A. Fellow of the Cambridge Philosophical Society, late Scholar of St. John's College, Cambridge, has been appointed Superintendent of the Female Orphan School at Paramatta, and Chaplain to the Colony in New South Wales. Patron, Earl Bathurst.

MARRIED.

The Rev. John Maynard, M.A. of Exeter College, Oxford, eldest son of Walter Maynard, Esq. of the Island of Nevis, to Elizabeth, second daughter of the late Robert Claxton, Esq. of Bristol.

The Rev. William Stamer, of Ingoldsthorp, Norfolk, second son of Sir William Stamer, Bart. of Dublin, to Ann Margaret, second daughter of the late Colonel Lock, of the East India Company's service.

The Rev. John Rowley, Prebendary of St. Michael's Dublin, and Rector of Lurgan, to Catherine, second daughter of Joseph Clarke, Esq. of Goswell-street, London.

At Edinburgh, the Rev. James Gregory, Precentor of Kildare, and Rector of Harristown, to Jane, eldest daughter of the late Alexander Begbie, Esq. of London.

The Rev. Travers Jones, of Athlone, to Frances Sarab, eldest daughter of the late J. A. Newton, Esq. of Cheshire, Cheshire.

At the British Ambassador's Chapel, at Paris, the Rev. Mr. Hill, to Maria, eldest daughter of the late Wakeman Long, Esq. of Upton-upon-Severn.

DECEASED.

Scotland.

In the Manse of Nigg, at the advanced age of 89, the Rev. D. Crudden, D.D. fifty-seven years Minister of that parish.

The Rev. George Wright, D.D. one of the Ministers of Stirling.

The Rev. W. Peebles, D.D. aged 75, Minister of Newton, Ayr.

Geneva.

At Geneva, the Hon. and Rev. R. S. L. Melville, M.A. of Trinity College, Cambridge.

East Indies.

At Bhoog, on the 8th of March, aged 27, the Rev. Thomas Lavie, Chaplain to the Troops in Cutch, and eldest son of the late Sir Thomas Lavie, K.C.B.

PROCEEDINGS

OF

THE UNIVERSITIES.

OXFORD.

DEGREES CONFERRED.—FROM OCTOBER TO DECEMBER, INCLUSIVE.

BACHELOR AND DOCTOR IN DIVINITY—
(*by accumulation.*)

December 1.

The Rev. William Vansittart, Christ Church, Grand Compounder.

DOCTORS IN CIVIL LAW.

October 19.

Charles Bellamy, Fellow of St. John's College, and one of the Fellows on the Vinerian Foundation.

October 26.

Robert Marsham, Esq. Warden of Merton College.

DOCTORS IN MEDICINE.

October 19.

Charles Joseph Bishop, St. Mary Hall.

MASTERS OF ARTS.

October 10.

Richard Leonard Adams, Christ Church, Grand Compounder.

The Rev. Thomas Shaw Hellier, Lord Crewe's Exhibitioner, of Lincoln College.

The Rev. John Welsh, Queen's College.

The Rev. George Henry Webber, Christ Church.

The Rev. Honoratus Leigh Thomas, Christ Church.

The Rev. Thomas Henderson, Christ Church.

The Rev. Augustus Short, Christ Church.

October 19.

John Bramston, Exeter College.

October 26.

The Rev. John Phillips Roberts, New College.

The Rev. Charles Joseph Pring, New College.

James Harwood Harrison, Merton College.

November 16.

Edward Denison, Fellow of Merton College, Grand Compounder.

John Hopkins, St. John's College, Grand Compounder.

Edward Hinchliffe, Worcester College.

The Rev. John Jones, St. Alban Hall.

The Rev. Charles Harbin, Fellow of Wadham College.

November 23.

The Rev. Henry Haddon Green, Worcester College.

The Rev. Anthony Berwick Lechmere, Christ Church.

December 1.

David Aitcheson, Queen's College,

The Rev. William Penfold, Lincoln College.

The Rev. William Busfield, Scholar of University College.

The Rev. James Joseph Goodall, Pembroke College.

December 7.

The Rev. Charles Walcot, Trinity College, Grand Compounder.

The Rev. Robert Sanders, Magdalen Hall.

Edward Trafford Leigh, Brasenose College.

William Barrett, Magdalen College.

The Rev. David Jones, Jesus College.

The Rev. George St. John, Wadham College.

December 18.

The Rev. Christopher Rawlins, Merton College, Grand Compounder.

The Rev. John Gladstone, Brasenose College.

The Rev. Frederick Urquhart, Brasenose College.

The Rev. John Langley, Magdalen Hall.

BACHELORS IN DIVINITY.

November 16.

George Hornby, Fellow of Brasenose College.

December 18.

The Rev. John Thomas Lys, Fellow of Exeter College.

BACHELORS OF ARTS.

October 10.

William Henry Parson, Magdalen Hall.

October 19.

George Heron, Brasenose College.

Samuel John Ingram Lockhart, Lincoln College.

Wilson Hetherington, Trinity College.

George Henry Bosanquet, Trinity College.

Jacob Joseph Marsham, Christ Church.

John Perry, Scholar of Balliol College.

John West, Worcester College.

Thomas Harding, Worcester College.

William Scott Robinson, Exeter College.

Philip Lovell Phillips, Exeter College.

November 16.

Samuel Vere Dashwood, Brasenose College, Grand Compounder.

Thomas Fielder Woodham, Worcester College.

Henry Chaytor, St. Mary Hall.

Richard John Beadon, Queen's College.

Charles Henry John Anderson, Oriel College.

Samuel Wilberforce, Oriel College.

Rowland Webster, Lord Crewe's Exhibitioner, Lincoln College.

William Yarnton Mills, Trinity College.

George Dawson, Trinity College.

George Gregory Gardiner, Exeter College.

November 23.

Henry Denny, Worcester College.

Edward Powlett Blunt, Corpus Christi College.

Edmund Barker Ray, Brasenose College.

William Blundell, Brasenose College.

Robert Marriott Caldecott, Brasenose College.

John Day, Exeter College.

John Byron, Exeter College.

Thomas Collett, Trinity College.

Henry Hodgkinson Robart, Christ Church.

Thomas Griffith, Jesus College.

William Capel, Merton College.

William Curling, Wadham College.

Morgan Davies, Wadham College.

John Goulter Dowling, Wadham College.

William Thomas Clarke, Queen's College.

Christopher Francis Godmond, Queen's College.

Thomas Clarke, Pembroke College.

December 1.

Thomas Harding, Worcester College.

William Hodgson, Queen's College.

Samuel Hingeston, Lincoln College.

Edward John Ward, Trinity College.

John Thomas Hope, Christ Church.

Peter Maurice, Jesus College.

George Lea, Wadham College.

George Robert Kensit, Wadham College.

Thomas Penruddocke, Wadham College.

George Henry Montagu, Balliol College.

John Ley, Exeter College.

Henry Moresby, Exeter College.

December 7.

Thomas Sheppard Smith, Worcester College.

John Thomas Trevelyan, St. Mary Hall.

George Ferris Whidborne Mortimer,

Michel Fellow of Queen's College.

Richard Postlethwaite, Edmund Hall.
 Sommerton Tudor, Edmund Hall.
 Robert Henry King, Magdalen Hall.
 Edmund Pepys, Oriel College.
 William Surman, Trinity College.
 The Lord Viscount Newark, Christ Church.
 William Dowdeswell, Christ Church.
 Charles Pocock, Christ Church.
 Arthur Johnson, Christ Church.
 Alfred Browne, Christ Church.
 Charles Stone, University College.
 William Faber, University College.
 John Forster Alleyne, Balliol College.
 Henry Thorpe, Fellow of St. John's College.
 Joseph Berry King, Exeter College.

December 18.

Frederick Henry Tompson, Queen's College.
 Henry James Buckoll, Michel Scholar of Queen's College.
 William Robert Bigg, Queen's College.
 Henry Wrightson, Queen's College.
 George Wood, Lord Crew's Exhibitioner of Lincoln College.
 Lovelace Bigg Wither, Oriel College.
 John Wordsworth, New College.
 Edward Simms, Wadham College.
 David Scott Meikleham, Balliol College.
 Francis Blake Woodward, Balliol College.
 Frederick Eyre, St. John's College.
 Frederick Pym, Worcester College.
 John Crosse, Exeter College.

BACHELOR IN CIVIL LAW.

October 27.

Robert Marsham, Esq. M.A. and Warden of Merton College.

BACHELOR OF MUSIC.

December 7.

Mr. W. Marshall, Organist of Christ Church, and of St. John's.

MISCELLANEOUS INTELLIGENCE.

September 28.

The Rev. G. B. Boraston was elected Fellow of Queen's College, on Mr. Michel's Foundation.

October 9.

In full Convocation, the Rev. RICHARD JENKYNs, D.D. Master of Balliol College, was nominated and admitted Vice-Chan-

cellor of the University; and, at the same time, Mr. Vice-Chancellor nominated the Rev. George William Hall, D.D. Master of Pembroke College, the Rev. John Collier Jones, D.D. Rector of Exeter College, the Rev. George Rowley, D.D. Master of University College, and the Rev. Ashurst Turner Gilbert, D.D. Principal of Brasenose College, to be his Pro-Vice-Chancellors for the ensuing year.

October 17.

Mr. Henry Edward Knatchbull was admitted a Founder's Kin Scholar of Wadham College.

October 18.

The Rev. C. K. Willams, M.A. Scholar of Pembroke College, was admitted a Fellow of that society.

The Rev. John Whittington Ready Landor, M.A. of Worcester College, was admitted Probationary Fellow of Exeter College, on the nomination of the Dean and Chapter of Exeter.

October 20.

Mr. Edward Cockey, of the Diocese of Bath and Wells, was admitted Scholar of Wadham College.

October 27.

Francis Rawlinson Robinson, M.A. Scholar of Corpus Christi College, of the county of Oxford, was admitted a Probationer Fellow of that Society.

November 7.

The nomination of the Rev. James Thos. Round, M.A. and Fellow of Balliol College, as one of the Public Examiners in *Literis Humanioribus*, was approved in Convocation.

The Rev. Charles Atmore Ogilvie, M.A. and Fellow of Balliol College, has been nominated and approved in Convocation as a Delegate of Accounts, in the room of the Very Rev. the Dean of Chester, resigned.

November 10.

Charles John Boyle, Esq. was admitted Founder's Kin Fellow of All Souls' College.

November 28.

Edward Kitson, B.A. and Scholar, George Moberly, B.A. both of Balliol College, and Francis William Newman, B.A. of Worcester College, were elected Fellows of the former Society.

November 29.

Mr. Henry Weir White, B.A. Scholar of Jesus College, was elected a Fellow of that Society.

December 1.

Mr. Whitfield was elected Scholar of Corpus Christi College on the Oxfordshire Foundation.

December 5.

The nomination of the following Gentlemen to be Select Preachers for 1827 was unanimously approved of in Convocation :—

The Rev. Charles M. Mount, M.A. late Fellow of Corpus Christi College.

The Rev. John A. Cramer, M.A. late Student of Christ Church.

The Rev. Frederick C. Blackstone, B.C.L. late Fellow of New College.

The Rev. Charles Carr Clerke, M.A. Student of Christ Church.

The Rev. Charles Girdlestone, M.A. late Fellow of Balliol College.

On the same day, the Rev. Henry Hart Milman, M.A. late Fellow of Brasenose College, was unanimously re-elected Professor of Poetry.

December 18.

The nomination of John Williams, M.A. Student of Christ Church, to be one of the Masters of the Schools, was approved of in Convocation.

The Rev. George Taylor, M.A. of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, and Master of Dedham School, was incorporated as a member of St. John's College.

December 22.

The Rev. Theophilus Biddulph, M.A. was admitted a Probationary Fellow of Corpus Christi College.

December 24.

Messrs. Robert William Goodenough, Wm. Emmanuel Page, Frederick Biscoe, John Robert Hall, and Henry Partington, were admitted actual Students of Christ Church, having been elected from Westminster in May last.

The following Noblemen have been admitted Members of Christ Church, in the last Term:—Lord Marsham, son of the Earl of Romney; the Earl of Rawdon, son of the Marquis of Hastings; Lord Villiers, son of the Earl of Jersey; and

the Earl of Ossory, son of the Marquis Ormonde.

Congregations will be holden for the purpose of granting Graces, and conferring Degrees, on the following days in the ensuing Term, viz.

Jan. Monday, 15	Mar. Thursday, 8
Feb. Thursday, 1	— Thursday, 15
— Thursday, 8	— Thursday, 22
— Thursday, 15	— Thursday, 29
— Thursday, 22	April, Saturday, 7
— Tuesday, 27	

No person will, on any account, be admitted as a candidate for the Degree of B.A. or M.A. or for that of B.C.L. without proceeding through Arts, whose name is not entered in the book, kept for that purpose at the Vice-Chancellor's house, on or before the day preceding the day of congregation.

EXAMINATIONS.

The names of those candidates, who at the close of the Public Examinations in Michaelmas Term, were admitted by the Public Examiners into the three Classes of *Literæ Humaniores* and *Disciplinæ Mathematicæ et Physicæ* respectively, according to the alphabetical arrangement of each class prescribed by the statute, stand as follow :—

1st Class.—In *Literæ Humaniores*.

Denison, Geo. Anthony, Christ Church.

Hope, John Thomas, Christ Church.

Mortimer, George Ferres Whidborne, Queen's College.

Newark, Right Hon. Viscount, Christ Church.

2nd Class.

Bentinck, Lord Henry Cavendish, Christ Church.

Blunt, Edward Powlett, Corpus Christi College.

Gower, John Alexander, Magdalen College.

Lea, George, Wadham College.

Simms, Edward, Wadham College.

Trower, Walter John, Christ Church.

Wilberforce, Samuel, Oriel College.

Wither, Lovelace Bigg, Oriel College.

3rd Class.

Bevan, Charles D. Balliol College.

Buckoll, Henry James, Queen's College.

Chambers, John David, Oriel College.
 Clay, James, Balliol College.
 Collett, Thomas, Trinity College.
 Crosse, John Dudley, Exeter College.
 Davies, Morgan, Wadham College.
 Dawson, George, Exeter College.
 Eden, Robert, Christ Church.
 Harding, John, Worcester College.
 Heming, Thomas John, Christ Church.
 Lawrence, Charles Washington, Brasenose College.
 Smythe, Patrick Murray, Christ Church.

JOHN WILSON,
 EDWARD BURTON,
 PHILIP WYNTER,
 JOSEPH DORNFORD,
 ROBT. BATEMAN PAUL,
 JAMES THOMAS ROUND, } Examiners.

1st Class.—In Discip. Mathemat. et Phys.

Dawson, George, Exeter College.
 Maude, Joseph, Queen's College.
 Maurice, Robert, Christ Church.
 Trower, Walter John, Christ Church.
 Webster, Rowland, Lincoln College.
 Wilberforce, Samuel, Oriel College.

WILLIAM KAY,
 RICHARD GRESWELL, } Examiners.
 ROBERT WALKER,

The number of candidates who form the Fourth Class, but whose names are not published, amounts to 101.

PRIZES.

CHANCELLOR'S PRIZES.

[Three Prizes of £20 each are annually given for the best compositions in Latin Verse, Latin Prose, and English Prose.]

Subjects for 1827.

Latin Verse—"Mexicum."

English Essay—"The influence of the Crusades upon the arts and literature of Europe."

Latin Essay—"Lex apud Romanos agraria."

SIR ROGER NEWDIGATE'S PRIZE.

Subject for 1827.

English Verse—"Pompeii."

REV. DR. ELLERTON'S THEOLOGICAL PRIZE.

[Of £21 annually, for the best English Essay on some doctrine or duty of the

Christian Religion, or on some of the points on which we differ from the Romish Church, or on any other subject of Theology which shall be deemed meet and useful.]

Subject for 1827.

"What was the object of the Reformers in maintaining the following proposition, and by what arguments did they establish it? 'Holy Scripture is the only sure foundation of any article of faith.'"

SUMMARY OF THE MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY THIS YEAR.

	Members of Convocation.	Members on the Books.
1 University	105 . .	205
2 Balliol	83 . .	220
3 Merton	68 . .	119
4 Exeter	81 . .	249
5 Oriel	144 . .	275
6 Queen's	135 . .	314
7 New	62 . .	143
8 Lincoln	54 . .	127
9 All Souls	68 . .	94
10 Magdalen	114 . .	163
11 Brasenose	228 . .	425
12 Corpus	67 . .	114
13 Christ Church	404 . .	800
14 Trinity	87 . .	222
15 St. John's	127 . .	217
16 Jesus	56 . .	173
17 Wadham	65 . .	185
18 Pembroke	66 . .	170
19 Worcester	86 . .	204
20 St. Mary Hall	29 . .	76
21 Magdalen Hall	38 . .	150
22 New Inn Hall	1 . .	1
23 St. Alban Hall	11 . .	45
24 St. Edmund Hall	41 . .	103
	2220	4794

Determining Bachelors in Lent . . . 281
 Matriculations . 401 | Regents . . . 194

TERMS for 1827.

Lent Term begins Jan. 15, ends April 7
 Easter Term . Apr. 25, . . . June 2
 Trinity Term . June 6, . . . July 7
 Michaelmas Term, Oct. 10, . . . Dec. 17

The Act will be July 3.

CAMBRIDGE.

DEGREES CONFERRED FROM OCTOBER TO DECEMBER, INCLUSIVE.

DOCTOR IN DIVINITY.

December 15.

Rev. Joseph Lawson Sisson, Clare Hall.

December 7.

C. Giles Bridle Daubeney, Doctor of Medicine, Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, and Aldrichian Professor of Chemistry, was admitted *ad eundem*.

HONORARY MASTERS OF ARTS.

December 4.

Hon. Francis George Molyneux, Trinity College.

Hon. Frederick Dudley Ryder, Trinity College.

MASTERS OF ARTS.

October 10.

Rev. John Richardson Major, Trinity College.

Richard Andrew, Trinity College.

Rev. James Hargreaves, St. John's College.

Rev. Thomas Ward Franklyn, St. John's College.

Rev. Charles Pleydell Neale Wilton, St. John's College.

Rev. Thomas Taylor, Catharine Hall.

October 13.

Thomas Sewell, Sidney College.

October 23.

William Balfour Winning, Trinity College.

Rev. Henry Jeffreys, St. John's College.

William Newland Welsby, St. John's College.

Rev. Thomas Scott Scratton, Christ's College.

November 13.

Rev. Charles Whately, Trinity College.

Rev. David Morton, Trinity College.

Frederick North, St. John's College.

Compounder.

John Longe, Jesus College.

Rev. T. B. Whitehurst, St. Peter's College, Compounder.

Rev. R. Montgomery, St. Peter's College, Compounder.

December 4.

Joshua S. Crompton, Jesus College.

December 15.

Rev. Frederick Fitzwilliam Trench, St. Peter's College.

Rev. Edward Martin, St. Peter's College, *ad eundem*, incorporated from Dublin.

Rev. Thomas Hutton Crofts, Pembroke Hall.

LICENTIATES IN PHYSIC.

December 4.

Thomas Waterfield, M.B. Christ College, Compounder.

December 15.

Benjamin Babington, M. B. Pembroke Hall.

BACHELORS IN DIVINITY.

November 13.

Rev. William Hewson, St. John's College, Compounder.

December 15.

Rev. Carew Thomas Elers, Queen's College.

Rev. Daniel Croathwaite, Queen's College.

BACHELORS OF ARTS.

October 9.

Richard Fiennes Wykeham Martin, Trinity College.

Edward King Tenison, Trinity College, Compounder.

Joshua Frederick Denham, St. John's College.

Alexander Power, Catharine Hall, Compounder.

Tyson Milnes, Catharine Hall.
Francis Law, Queen's College.
Joseph Gattley, Sidney College.

October 13.

John Chapman, Fellow of King's College.

George Hamilton, Fellow of King's College.

E. J. Owen, Downing College, Compounder.

October 21.

Mr. Henry Penneck, St. Peter's College.

December 15.

Oswald Marriott, St. John's College.

BACHELORS IN CIVIL LAW.

November 13.

Rev. Charles Williams, Trinity Hall.

Rev. William Webster, Jesus College.

Rev. John Badcock, St. Peter's College.

December 4.

Rev. William Mitchell, Trinity Hall.

Charles Barrett Lennard, Trinity Hall.

Rev. Henry De Brett, Downing College.

December 15.

Robert Bowcher Clarke, Trinity College.

BACHELOR IN PHYSIC.

December 15.

William Crosbie Mair, Jesus College.

MISCELLANEOUS INTELLIGENCE.

October 2.

Messrs. Thomas Remington, B.A. James Amiraux Jeremie, B.A. and James Challis, B.A. Scholars of Trinity College, were elected Fellows of that Society.

October 10, (first day of Term).

The following gentlemen were elected University Officers for the year ensuing:

PROCTORS.

The Rev. John Tomkyns, M.A. King's College.

The Rev. Stephen Pope, M.A. Emmanuel College.

TAXORS.

The Rev. John Hind, M.A. Sidney College.

The Rev. Henry Venn, M.A. Queen's College.

MODERATORS.

The Rev. Joshua King, M.A. Queen's College.

The Rev. Henry Coddington, M.A. Trinity College.

SCRUTATORS.

The Rev. Thomas Dickes, M.A. Jesus College.

The Rev. Henry Tasker, M.A. Pembroke Hall.

October 12.

The following gentlemen were appointed the Caput for the year ensuing:—

The Vice-Chancellor.

Rev. Martin Davy, D.D. Master of Caius College, *Divinity*.

Rev. J. W. Geldart, D.C.L. Trinity Hall, *Law*.

John Haviland, M.D. St. John's College, *Physic*.

Rev. George Elwes Corrie, Catharine Hall, *Senior Non-Regent*.

Rev. Alfred Ollivant, M.A. Trinity College, *Senior-Regent*.

October 21.

The Rev. Thomas S. Hughes, B.D. of Emmanuel College, and the Rev. Richard Twopeny, M.A. of St. John's College, were appointed Pro-Proctors for the year ensuing.

A letter has been addressed to the Vice-Chancellor by the Right Hon. Charles Williams Wynn, President of the India Board, of which the following is an extract:—

“Enclosed I have the honour to transmit to you a copy of the Regulations for the examination of candidates for Writerships in the service of the East India Company, which have been prepared by the Court of Directors, with the approbation of the Board of Commissioners for the affairs of India. You will find that it is proposed that two Examiners should be appointed from the University of Cambridge by the Vice-Chancellor and Regius Professors, with an annual stipend of £80, one of them to be annually replaced.”

" Plan for the examination of candidates for admission to the Civil Service, who have not resided at the College of Haileybury.

" The candidates will be examined in the Greek Testament, and in some of the works of the following Greek Authors, viz. Homer, Herodotus, Demosthenes, or in the Greek plays; also in some of the works of the following Latin Authors, viz. Livy, Cicero, Tacitus, and Juvenal, which part of the Examination will include collateral reading in Ancient History, Geography, and Philosophy.

" They will also be examined in Mathematics, including the four first and sixth Books of Euclid, Algebra, Logarithms, Plane Trigonometry, and Mechanics.

" In Modern History, principally taken from 'Russell's Modern Europe,' and in 'Paley's Evidences of Christianity.' "

October 30.

The Rev. Temple Chevallier, M.A. late Fellow and Tutor of Catharine Hall, Hulsean Lecturer, and the Rev. Alfred Ollivant, M.A. Fellow of Trinity College, were on Monday last elected Examiners of the Candidates for Writerships in the service of the East India Company, who have not resided at the College of Haileybury.

November 4.

The Rev. Christopher Wordsworth, D.D. Master of Trinity College, was elected Vice-Chancellor of the University for the year ensuing.

November 15.

In congregation the Rev. Watkin Maddy, M.A. Fellow of St. John's College, was appointed Moderator, in the room of J. King, Esq. Fellow of Queen's College, resigned.

At the same congregation a grace passed the Senate to give £50 from the university chest to the subscription for rebuilding the English church at Amsterdam.

December 6.

In congregation graces to the following effect passed the Senate :—

To appoint Mr. Byam, of King's, Mr. Weller, of Emmanuel, Mr. Graham, of Christ's College, and Mr. T. P. Platt, of Trinity, Examiners, at the classical examination after admission ad respondendum questionum.

To appoint Mr. Rennell, of King's, Mr. Waterfield, of Emmanuel, Mr. Adams, of Sidney, and Mr. Fennell, of Queen's, Examiners at the previous examination in Lent Term, 1827.

To appoint Mr. Maddy Deputy Proctor in the absence of Mr. Pope.

To present a copy of each of the books printed at the expense of the University to the library of St. David's College, Lampeter.

December 7.

George Biddell Airy, Esq. M.A. Fellow of Trinity College, was elected Lucasian Professor of Mathematics, on the resignation of the Rev. Thomas Turton, B.D. Mr. Airy took his first degree in 1823, being thus early the Senior Wrangler of his year; and has, at successive meetings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society, communicated the results of various scientific investigations.

James Parke, Esq. M.A. Barrister at Law, is elected Auditor of Trinity College, in the room of Sir Nicholas Conyngham Tindal, his Majesty's Solicitor General.

Lord Gardner is admitted of Trinity College.

Two Craven scholarships are now vacant. The examination of candidates will commence on the 29th of January next.

December 15.

In a congregation this day, graces to the following effect passed the Senate :—

To confer the degree of D.D. by Royal Mandate, on Mr. Mill, Principal of Bishop's College, Calcutta.

To appoint Mr. Hind, of Sidney, and Mr. Cantis, of Christ's College, Examiners, with the Proctors and Moderators, of the first six classes of Questionists, in January, 1827.

To appoint Mr. Chevallier, Mr. Warren, Mr. Kirby, and Mr. Foley, Examiners of the seventh and eighth classes of Questionists, in January, 1827.

To appoint Mr. Rennell and Mr. Waterfield additional Examiners, of the seventh and eighth classes of Questionists, in January, 1827.

December 16.

The Right Hon. Sir John Copley, Master of the Rolls, was unanimously re-elected Representative in Parliament for this University.

There will be congregations on the following days of the Lent term :—

Saturday . . . Jan. 20, (Bachelor's Com.) at ten.
 Wednesday . . Feb. 7, at eleven.
 Wednesday . . March 7, at eleven.
 Friday — 30, (M.A. Incceptors) at ten.
 Friday April 6, (end of term) at ten.

SUMMARY OF THE MEMBERS OF THE
 UNIVERSITY THIS YEAR.

	Members of the Senate.	Members on the Boards.
Trinity College . . .	597 . . .	1375
St. John's College . .	444 . . .	1082
Queen's College . . .	61 . . .	290
Emmanuel College . .	99 . . .	215
Christ's College . . .	59 . . .	224
Jesus College	74 . . .	191
Caius College	78 . . .	228
St. Peter's College . .	59 . . .	192
Clare Hall	62 . . .	156
Corpus Christi College	37 . . .	153
Trinity Hall	27 . . .	138
Catharine Hall	30 . . .	133
Pembroke Hall	43 . . .	111
King's College	85 . . .	109
Sidney College	36 . . .	94
Magdalen College . . .	37 . . .	98
Downing College . . .	14 . . .	65
Commorantes in Villa .	12 . . .	12
	1854	4866

Comparative View of Members on the
 Boards.

1748 . . .	1500
1813 . . .	2805
1824 . . .	4489
1826 . . .	4866

This University has a majority of seventy-four members over that of Oxford this year.

PRIZES.

HULSEAN PRIZE.

[A prize of £40 to any Member of the University under the degree or standing of M.A. who composes the best Dissertation, in the English language, on the Evidences in general, or on the Prophecies or Miracles in particular,

or on any other particular argument, whether the same be direct or collateral proof of the Christian Religion, in order to evince its truth and excellence.]

Subject for the past year :—

A critical examination of our Saviour's Discourses, with regard to the evidence which they afford of his Divine Nature.

Adjudged to—

William Michael Mayers, Catharine Hall.

Subject for the present year :—

The Contention between Paul and Barnabas.

CHANCELLOR'S GOLD MEDAL.

[For the best English Poem by a Resident Undergraduate.]

Subject for the present year :—

The Druids.

N.B.—These exercises are to be sent in to the Vice-Chancellor on or before March 31, 1827; and are not to exceed 200 lines in length.

MEMBERS' PRIZES.

[1. Two prizes of fifteen guineas each, for the encouragement of Latin Prose composition, to be open to all Bachelors of Arts, without distinction of years, who are not of sufficient standing to take the degree of Master of Arts: and 2. Two other prizes of fifteen guineas each, to be open to all Undergraduates, who shall have resided not less than seven terms, at the time when the exercises are to be sent in.]

The subjects for the present year are :—

1. For the Bachelors.
 Homerus.

2. For the Undergraduates.
 Græcia capta ferum victorem cepit, et artes
 Intulit agresti Latio.

N. B.—These exercises are to be sent in on or before April 30, 1827.

SIR WILLIAM BROWNE'S MEDALLISTS.

[Three Gold Medals, of five guineas each, to three Undergraduates :—1. For the best Greek Ode in imitation of Sappho. 2. For the best Latin Ode in imitation of Horace. 3. For the best Greek and Latin Epigrams, the former after the

manner of the Anthologia, the latter after the model of Martial.]

The subjects for the present year are :—

1. *For the Greek Ode.*
Sanctius his animal . . .
Deerat adhuc, et quod dominari in
catera posset :—
Natus Homo est—
2. *For the Latin Ode.*
Iphigenia in Aulide.
3. *For the Epigrams.*
Παθήματα, μαθήματα.

N.B.—These exercises are to be sent in on or before April 30, 1827. The Greek Ode is not to exceed twenty, and the Latin Ode twenty-five stanzas.

PORSON UNIVERSITY PRIZE.

[The Dividends of £400 Navy 5 per cent. to be expended in the purchase of Greek Books, to be given to an Under-graduate yearly, at the commencement, as a Prize for Greek Verses.]

The subject for the present year is,
As YOU LIKE IT, Act II. Scene 3.
Beginning . . . But do not so: I have, &c.
And ending . . . — with truth and
loyalty.

N.B.—The metre to be Tragicum Iambicum Trimetrum Acutelecticum. These exercises are to be accentuated and accompanied by a literal Latin prose version, and are to be sent in on or before the 30th of April, 1827.

NORRISIAN PRIZE.

[A prize of £12, to the Author of the best Prose Essay on a Sacred Subject.]

Subject for the ensuing year is,
The Proofs of a General Judgment to come, and the advantages of the knowledge revealed to mankind concerning it.

N.B.—All the above exercises are to be sent in to the Vice-Chancellor privately; each is to have some motto prefixed, and to be accompanied by a paper sealed up, with the same motto on the outside; which paper is to enclose another, folded up, having the candidate's name and college written within. The papers containing the names of those candidates who may not succeed, will be destroyed unopened. No prize will be given to any exercise which is written, wholly or in part, (or of which the title, motto, superscription, address, &c. are written,) in the handwriting of the candidate. Any candidate is at liberty to send in his exercise *printed or lithographed*. No prize will be given to any candidate who has not, at the time of sending in the exercises, resided one term at the least.

The Seatonian Prize has not been adjudged.

TERMS for 1827.

	begins.	ends.	div.
Lent Term	Jan. 13	April 6	Feb. 21, m.
Easter	April 25	July 6	May 31, m.
Michael.	Oct. 10	Dec. 16	Nov. 12, m.

The commencement will be July 3.

ST. DAVID'S COLLEGE, CARDIGANSHIRE.

St. David's College, which was founded in 1822, by the present Bishop of Salisbury, at Llampeter in Cardiganshire, for the benefit of the clergy in South Wales, the poverty of whose preferment precludes them from the advantages of an University education, is to be opened by the Bishop of St. David's in the ensuing February, when it will be incorporated by Royal Charter. The style of the building is Gothic; and the beauty of its design reflects great honour on the architect, Mr. Cockrell. It is calculated to accommodate about seventy students; and the Bishop of St. David's intends to admit persons from any part of the kingdom, provided they be members of the

Church of England. The annual expense will, it is expected, be within £55. A valuable collection of books has been presented to it by the Bishop of Salisbury, to which many of the Colleges and Members of the University of Oxford have liberally contributed. A grace has also passed the Senate of the University of Cambridge, to give to it a copy of all books that have been printed at its expense or are now in the press. The Rev. Llewellyn Lewellin, M.A. of Jesus College, Oxford, has been appointed Principal; and the Rev. Alfred Ollivant, M.A. Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, Vice-Principal and Senior Tutor.

UNIVERSITY OF DUBLIN.

DEGREES CONFERRED FROM JANUARY TO DECEMBER, INCLUSIVE.

February 4.

Present the Provost and all the senior Fellows. The grace of the house for the Degree of A.B. was granted to one Filius Nobilis (The Hon. Harvey De Montmorency), four Fellow Commoners, one hundred and sixty-two Pensioners, and two Sizars.

May 20.

The Provost informed the Board, that he had, according to their request, communicated to the Lord Chancellor the resolution which had been agreed to unanimously at a former meeting, of conferring an Honorary Degree of LL.D. on the Right Honourable Thomas Lord Manners, Lord High Chancellor of Ireland, in testimony of the high sense which this Board entertain of his eminent legal attainments, and of the talents, integrity, and courtesy with which he has uniformly discharged the duties of his distinguished and important station. His Lordship's answer to this communication, addressed to the Provost, was laid before the Board on the same day. It was expressed as follows:

Dublin, May 20, 1826.

DEAR SIR,

I have this instant received your communication of the honour conferred on me by the Provost and Fellows of Trinity College, Dublin, at a Board held this day, and which alone must be considered by me as a most flattering and distinguished mark of their approbation; but accompanied as it is by the expressions contained in the resolution, and proceeding from so learned and highly respectable a body, I am at a loss sufficiently to express my gratitude, and the importance I attach to so valuable a testimony to my conduct.

I must beg of you to return my warm and sincere thanks to the members of the Board, and to accept the same from,

My Dear Sir,

Very sincerely yours,
(Signed) MANNERS.

To the Reverend
the Provost of T.C.D.

DOCTOR IN DIVINITY.

July 8.

Rev. William Phelan.

Mathew Esmonde White.

George Rumley.

William Connor.

Howard Cooke.

BACHELORS AND DOCTORS IN DIVINITY.

July 8.

Rev. Stewart Segar Trench.

Rev. Dionysius Lardner.

Rev. William Bailey.

Rev. John Seymour.

Lees Gifford.

George Grierson.

BACHELORS IN MEDICINE.

July 8.

Edward Stack.

John Davidson McCreedy.

Henry Coulson Beauchamp.

James Donovan.

Claudius Henry Auchinleck.

William Richard Vincent Lane.

William Cummins.

Robert Plunket.

MASTERS OF ARTS AND BACHELORS
IN MEDICINE.*July 8.*

John Elliott.

Percival Hunt.

Shewbridge Connor.

William Corbett.

Thomas Fox.

MASTERS OF ARTS.

July 8.

Rev. William Le Poer Trench.

Rev. William Burkitt Moorehead.

Rev. Thomas Jervis White.

Rev. Mortimer O'Sullivan (without fees).

Rev. James Stewart Blacker.
 Rev. John Darley, J.F.T.C.D.
 Rev. Edward Herbert.
 Rev. William Morris Holt Williams.
 Rev. Travers Jones.
 Rev. Robert Hume.
 John Clendinning.
 Hilary Frederick L'Estrange.
 John Brown.
 Edward Grogan.
 Alexander Reade.
 William Brereton.
 George Harkness.
 Alexander Donovan.
 John Creery Ferguson.

Also the Degree of A.B. to eighty-three candidates, of whom forty-seven were Fellow Commoners, thirty-five Pensioners, and one Sizar.

MISCELLANEOUS UNIVERSITY INTELLIGENCE.

January 28.

It was on this day ordered by the Board, that the matriculation of students just admitted shall be on the two days of the examination of junior freshmen, and the day following; and that those who do not so matriculate shall not be allowed their examinations.

April 29.

Present all the Members of the Board. There being a Bill in progress in the House of Commons, by which "any Clergyman, who shall have to the amount of three hundred pounds per annum in the church, shall be refused a faculty to enable him to hold another living in addition;" and it being considered that a regulation of this kind might hereafter interfere with arrangements whereby small College livings can now be rendered available, the Board have requested that the Provost shall go and confer with the Right Hon. the Attorney General for Ireland, (the representative of the University in Parliament,) on this subject.

May 22.

The following were elected into the vacant Scholarships: viz.

John Meade. Thomas Byrne.
 Stephen Browne. Patrick Cullinan.
 Wm. Short Thynne. Walter Delamere.
 These were all admitted in the usual form on the following morning.

July 1.

The following Students (who had been candidates for Scholarships,) were elected into exhibitions: viz.

Murphy.	M'Donagh.
Sharkey.	Lloyd, 1.
Brady.	Beatty, J.

July 3.

At the Entrance Examination, holden on this day, ninety-seven candidates, out of one hundred and three, were admitted.

July 7.

This being the regular day for holding the Summer Commencements, but the appointment of a new Vice Chancellor, in place of the late Lord Downes, not having yet arrived, there was a meeting in the Theatre, of the Provost, Fellows, Masters, and Professors, and of the several candidates for Degrees; and the Provost having called on the Proctors to read over the names of the candidates for Degrees in both Senior and Junior Commencements, each candidate signed his name to an engagement as follows:—

"We, the undersigned, do hereby promise that we will attend at some future Commencement, to take the oaths required by law, and to be admitted to the Degrees for which the Grace of the House has been granted to us." (Signed by the several candidates for Degrees.)

July 10.

A meeting of the Provost, Fellows, and Scholars, was holden in the Theatre, for the purpose of electing a Burgess for the University, when the Right Honourable WILLIAM CONYNGHAM PLUNKET, His Majesty's Attorney-General for Ireland, was proposed by DR. PHIPPS, S.F.T.C.D., seconded by Sir O'Donoghue, senior scholar of the House, and unanimously elected.

October 16.

At the Entrance Examination, holden on this day, one hundred and twenty-eight, out of one hundred and thirty-nine candidates were admitted.

November 6.

At the Entrance Examination, holden on this day, of one hundred and thirty-four persons who presented themselves for

admission, one hundred and twenty-four were afterwards entered on the books.

November 20.

The Officers for the ensuing year were elected at a meeting of the Board. The arrangements of the preceding year were retained, with the following exceptions :

Dr. Lloyd was appointed one of the Preachers, in the room of Mr. Griffin, elected to serve as Junior Dean ; and Mr. Martin, Junior Proctor.

The usual oaths were administered the following morning at a Meeting of the Provost and Fellows, holden for that purpose in the chapel.

November 25.

The Annual Visitation was holden on this day, The Right Honourable the Lord Chancellor being present as Vice-Chancellor in the place of the late Lord Chief Justice, and His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin, as Visitor of the University.

The Provost, Fellows, and Scholars of the University attended, in pursuance of the summons usual on this occasion ; and the several heads of intelligence, respecting the state of learning and number of students in the University, were submitted by the former to their Lordships, who were pleased to express themselves highly gratified by the appearance which the returns exhibited.

PRIZES.

VICE-CHANCELLOR'S PRIZES.

[For the Spring Commencements.]

Adjudged to

Sir Taylor	} Prose.
Sir Conan	
Kelly.	}
Phayre.	
Gamble.	
O'Beirne.	

The subjects were :—

GRADUATE'S PRIZE.

Mihi autem orationis differentiam fecisse et dicentium et audientium naturæ videntur.

UNDERGRADUATE'S PRIZE.

*Terræ motum nemo pugnantium ad Trasi-
menum lacum sentit.*

[Entrance Examination.]

July 3.

Sir Greene.	Sir Taylor.
Sir O'Donoghue.	Sir Perdu
Sir O'Brien.	Kelly.

The subjects were :—

GRADUATE'S PRIZE.

In Greek, Latin, or English Prose,—

The attempt of Julian to rebuild the temple of Jerusalem.

UNDERGRADUATE'S PRIZE.

In Greek, Latin, or English Verse,—

Cometæ naufragium.

GOLD MEDALS

[For exemplary attendance on Greek Lectures.]

Adjudged to

Sir Callaghan. Sir Grier.

HEBREW PREMIUMS.

[Primate Newcome's foundation.]

Adjudged to

March 18.

Sir Conneys.	Sir Hamilton.
Sir Grier.	Sir Mercier.
Sir Irwin.	Sir Singleton.
Sir Archer.	

July 4.

Miller.	Campbell.
Mauleverer.	Meara.
Hunt.	O'Brien.
Turnley.	Bodkin.
Fraye.	Miller.
Knox.	Johnston.

October 17.

Odell.	M'Causland.
Waters.	Bunbury.
Drury.	Norris.
Meredith.	Quiuan.
Wright.	Creery.
Norman.	Frew.

November 7.

Walsh.	Downing.
Ball.	Roche.
Lloyd.	Bradshaw.
Boyd.	

Premiums on the same foundation were granted to the following Bachelors of Arts, July 8:—

Taylor.	Archer.
Todd.	Disney.
Ryal, sen.	Dowdall.
Hamilton.	

GOLD MEDALS,

"Propter insignes progressus in Artibus, et in Literis Humanioribus,"

Adjudged to

Mr. Berry.	Science.
Mr. Goolde.	Classics.

The several prizes on DR. DOWNES'S foundation, were conferred,

July 8.

For reading the Liturgy, on

Sir Mercier.	Sir Whiteside.
Sir O'Beirne.	Sir Gregg.
Sir Armstrong.	

For Composition, on

Sir Morgan.	Sir Gregg.
Sir Grier.	Sir Taylor.

For Extempore Speaking, on

Sir Taylor.	Sir Gregg.
-------------	------------

The subjects proposed, were: for composition,—“Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.” Matth. xxviii. 19.

For Extempore Speaking,—“Search the Scriptures.” John, v. 39.

On the same day the Mathematical Premiums, on BISHOP LAW'S foundation, were adjudged to

Sir Wilson.

MICHAELMAS QUARTERLY EXAMINATIONS.

Commenced October 20.

The candidates for the medal in *Artibus* were examined on the first two days; and for that in *Literis Humanioribus*, on the third and fourth. They were adjudged to the following:—

M'Causland, 2.	Science.
Fitzgerald, 2.	Classics.

The remaining candidates were,

Bernard, 1.	} Science.
Donnelly.	
Roche, 1.	
Fitz Gerald, 3.	
Fitz Gerald, 1.	
Shee.	

Bagott, 2.	} Science.
Prior.	
Mease.	
Hemmings.	} Classics.
O'Neil, S.	
Lonergan, 1.	

CERTIFICATES for general answering were at the same time granted to the following:—

Mr. Moore, 2.	Griffith, 4.
Tottenham.	Lowe.
Evans.	Lonergan, 2.
Lloyd, 1.	Delamare.
Hamilton, 2.	

PREMIUMS to the following:—

Blake, 1.	Thillaly, S.
Busteed.	Cullinan, J.
Stack, S.	Gosselin, S.

CERTIFICATES, *propter insignes progressus in Artibus*, to the following:—

Mr. Thyle.	Mr. Haig.
Henderson,	Kearney, S.
J. 1.	Hamblin.
Sadleir, 3.	Longfield.
Bleasby.	Blake, 5.
M'Cullagh.	Saville.

PREMIUMS to the following:—

Mr. Fortescue.	Mr. Collis, S.
Blake, 2.	Hardy.
Griffith, 5.	Mockler, J.
Lynch, 3.	Stack, J.
Ringwood.	Waugh.
Cosby, S.	Culligan.

CERTIFICATES, *propter insignes progressus in Literis Humanioribus*, were adjudged at the same time to the following:—

Mr. Pomeroy.	Mr. O'Hea.
Henderson, J.	Hardy.
Ormsby, 3.	Graydon.
Power, 2.	Leslie.
Mc. Cullagh.	Waugh.
Murphy.	Saville.

PREMIUMS to the following:

Mr. Ormsby.	Mr. Williamson.
Griffith, 5.	Hobart, J.
Nolan, J.	Blake, 5.
Whiteside.	Atkins, S.
Cowen, J.	M'Neece.
O'Grady.	

ANNUAL DIVINITY EXAMINATIONS.

Holden, November 22, and the following day, by the Very Reverend the Dean of Ardagh, Professor of Divinity, and the Rev. Dr. Wall, S.F.T.C.D. Archbishop King's Lecturer in Divinity.

The premiums were adjudged to the following:—

Sir Shaw. Sir Nixon.

Extra premiums were granted by the Board, in consideration of the excellent answering displayed, to the following:—

Sir Mercier. Sir Magrath.
Sir Ashe, S. Sir Prior.

NOTICES RESPECTING COURSES,
PRIZES, &c.

The First Three Books of Xenophon's *Cyropædia*, and of Livy, were added to the usual Course read by Candidates for entrance, by order of the Board. This Order to become effective from the first Monday in January, 1827, inclusive.

The Classical and Science Medal Courses were also revised during the past year. The following received the sanction of the Board:—

In Literis Humanioribus:—Æschyli Agamemnon, substituted for the Septem contra Thebas, which had hitherto been read.

Longinus de Sublimitate.
Aristotelis Rhetorica.
Taciti Annales.
Cicero de Oratore.
Horatii Epistola ad Pisonem.

In Artibus:—Butler's Analogy of Religion, natural and revealed, to the Constitution and Course of Nature.

Trigonometry, Plane and Spherical.

Analytical Geometry, with two Coordinates generally, and with three as far as the equation of a tangent plane to a curved surface.

The Elements of the Differential Calculus, generally, and the Integral, as far as is required for the other parts of the Course.

The Statics of an Invariable System, generally, and those of a Variable, as applied to the Equilibrium of Structures,

to the Funicular Polygon, and the Common Catenary.

The Dynamics of a material point in Vacuo, both free and constrained. The Theory of Central Forces, the force being single and the centre fixed.

The Dynamics of an Invariable System, moveable about a fixed axis in vacuo. Nature and investigation of the principal Axes, and Theory of the Compound Pendulum.

The Formulæ for the values of the more important moving and resisting forces which are engaged in Terrestrial Mechanics.

The principal of Virtual Velocities; and D'Alembert's Mechanical Principle, with its application to the Mechanic Powers.

Hydrostatics.

The Elements of Optics.

Plane Astronomy.

Physical Astronomy, as far as the Problem of the Two Bodies; and the discussion of Kepler's Laws as given in Newton's *Principia*, sections 2 and 3, 7, and the earlier propositions of the 11th section, book 1, and as the same are given in chap. i. book 2, of Laplace's *Mécanique Céleste*.

Though the Examination, *In Artibus* will be restricted by Subjects and not by Authors, yet the following works relating, some entirely, others almost entirely, to the prescribed subjects, are recommended to the particular attention of the candidates.

Woodhouse's Trigonometry.

Lloyd's Analytical Geometry.

Lardner's Algebraic Geometry.

Lacroix's *Théorie des Lignes Courbes*, as given in the Fourth Chapter of the First Volume of his large Work.

Lardner's Differential and Integral Calculus.

Poisson's *Traité de Mécanique*.

Venturoli's *Mechanics*, translated by Creswell, 2 parts.

Robinson's *Mechanics*.

Lardner on Central Forces.

Coddington's *Optics*.

Brinkley's *Astronomy*.

Woodhouse's *Plane Astronomy*, second Edition.

VICE-CHANCELLOR'S PRIZES.

The Subjects for the next commencements are,

GRADUATE'S PRIZE.

In Greek, Latin, or English Prose or Verse.

Saul consulens Pythonissam in Endor.

UNDERGRADUATE'S PRIZE.

In Greek, Latin, or English Verse,

Bhurtpore.

The Compositions are to be sent under fictitious signatures to the Senior Lecturer, on or before the 19th of January, 1827.

The following Table presents a view of the State of the University as to Members on the 24th Nov. 1826.

	Masters.	Fellow Comm- oners.	Scholars.	Pensioners.	Sizars.	Total.
Bachelors	7	43	46	74	16	186
Candidate Bachelors . . .			15	198	4	217
Senior Sophisters		53	6	200	3	262
Junior Sophisters		63	3	240	8	314
Senior Freshmen		58		413	10	481
Junior Freshmen		52		327	9	388
Total	7	269	70	1452	50	1848

QUARTERLY LIST

OF

FOREIGN THEOLOGICAL PUBLICATIONS.

Coquerel, Pasteur à Amsterdam, Biographie Sacrée. Vols. 1, 2, 3. 8vo. 1l. 11s. 6d. To be completed in 4 vols.

L'Ami du Bien, Journal consacré à la Morale Chrétienne, et aux progrès des Lettres, des Sciences, et des Arts. 1r cahier. Marseille.

James, Pasteur à Breda, Discours sur la corruption profonde, totale et universelle, du genre humain, et sur l'unique moyen par lequel l'homme pécheur peut-être justifié devant Dieu, &c. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

Liturgie en usage dans les Eglises Réformées de France. 1 vol. in 4to. 7s. 6d.

Histoire de l'Ancienne Principauté de Sedan, jusqu'à la fin du 18e Siècle; par J. Peyran, Pasteur de l'Eglise Reformée de cette ville. 2 vols. 8vo. 18s.

Mernadier, Pasteur à Vallon, *Essai sur l'Influence des Sociétés Bibliques.* 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Histoire de la Saint Barthélemy, d'après les Chroniques, Mémoires, et MSS. du 16e Siècle. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Précis Historique des Faits qui ont eu lieu lors de la Conversion de S. A. le Prince de Salm, de la Religion Catholique Romaine au Culte Chrétien Evangélique de la Confession de Augsburg, le 17 Mai, 1826, suivi des motifs de ce Changement de Communion; publié par ordre et aux frais du Prince. 8vo. 2s.

Vinet, *Mémoire en faveur de la Liberté des Cultes.* Ouvrage qui a obtenu le prix dans le concours ouvert par la Société de la Morale Chrétienne, le 13 Avril, 1826. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Cellerier, (Fils,) *De l'Origine Authentique et Divine de l'Ancien Testament.* 12mo. Geneve. 4s. 6d.

Notice sur Jean-Frederic Oberlin, Pasteur à Waldbach, au Ban-de-la-Roche, mort le 1er Juin, 1826, avec portrait. 8vo. 2s.

Bouvet de Cressé, *Résumé de l'Histoire des Papes.* 18mo. 4s. 6d.

Resumé de la doctrine des Jesuites, ou Extraits des assertions dangereuses et pernicieuses soutenues par les Jesuites dans leurs ouvrages dogmatiques; recueillies et imprimées par ordre du Parlement en 1762. 18mo. 4s. 6d.

Resumé de l'histoire des guerres de religion en France, par Saint-Maurice. 18mo. 3s. 6d.

Bibliothèque Choisie des Pères d'Eglise Grecque et Latine, par Guillon. Tom. XV. et XVI. 8vo. 1l. 1s.

Marcet de la Roche-Arnaud, *Les Jesuites modernes, pour faire suite au Mémoire de M. de Montlosier.* 8vo. 7s.

FRENCH PERIODICALS.

	Annual Subscription.
<i>Those marked thus † are Catholic.</i>	
† L'Ami de la Religion et du Roi; Journal ecclésiastique, politique et littéraire. 8vo. <i>Published weekly.</i>	£ s. d. 2 8 0
Ami de la Jeunesse. 32mo. <i>Monthly.</i>	0 3 0
Archives du Christianisme au XIXe. Siècle. 8vo. <i>Monthly.</i>	0 9 0
Bulletin de la Société Biblique Protestante de Paris. 8vo. <i>Monthly.</i>	0 5 0
† La France Chrétienne, Journal religieux, politique et littéraire. 8vo. <i>weekly.</i>	4 10 0
Journal de la Société de la Morale Chrétienne. 8vo. <i>Monthly.</i>	1 0 0
— des Missions Evangéliques. 8vo. <i>Monthly.</i>	0 12 0
† Mémorial Catholique. 8vo. <i>Monthly.</i>	1 4 0
Revue Protestante (à laquelle sont réunis les Mélanges de Religion publiés à Nismes par le Pasteur Vincent). 8vo. <i>Monthly.</i>	0 15 0

Alber, D. I. Nep., *Interpretatio sacræ scripturæ per omnes veteris et novi testamenti libros.* XVI. Tomi. 8maj. 8l. 8s. Pesthini 1801—4.

— — *Institutiones hermeneuticæ scripturæ sacræ veteris et novi testamenti. Juxta systema theologicæ noviss. præscriptum, concinn. sec. edidit.* VI. Tomi. 8maj. — Ibidem, 1817, 18. 3l. 13s. 6d.

Ammon, D. C. Fr. v., *Handbuch der christl. Sittenlehre.* 2r Bd. 1ste Abthl. gr. 8. 7s. Vol. I, published in 1823, is 10s.

Archiv, kirchenhistorisches, von K. F. Staudlin, H. G. Tzschirner und J. S. Vater, fuer 1826. 4 Hefte. 8. Halle. 10s.

Augusti, D. J. C. M., *Denkwuerdigkeiten aus der christlichen Archæologie; mit bestand Ruecksicht auf die gegenwärt. Beduerfnisse der christl. Kirche.* 8r Bd. — Auch u. d. Titel: *Die heiligen Handlungen der Christen.* 5r Bd. *Archæologie des Abendmahls.* gr. 8. Leipzig. 10s. Vols. I. to VII., published from 1817 to 1825, are 3l. 3s.

Beck, D. Fr. A. *Deutsche Synopsis der drei ersten Evangelisten.* Nach der griechischen Synopsis de Wette's, u. Luecke's bearb. Ein Handbuch fuer Lehrer in Schullehrer-Seminarien u. niedern Classen gelehrter Schulen, so wie f. jeden denkenden Christen. gr. 8. Berl. 4s. 6d.

THE
BRITISH CRITIC,
Quarterly Theological Review,
 AND
ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

APRIL, 1827.

- ART. I.—1. *Scholia in Sophoclis Tragædias Septem.* E Codice MS. Laurentiano descripsit Petrus Elmsley, S.T.P. Oxonii e Typographeo Clarendoniano. 1825.
2. *Sophoclis Tragædiæ Septem, ad optimorum Exemplarium fidem, ac præcipue Codicis vetustissimi Florentini emendatæ, cum Annotatione tantum non integra Brunckii et Schaferi, et aliorum selecta. Accedunt deperditarum Tragædiarum Fragmenta.* Oxonii. 1826. 2 vols. 8vo.

THE first of the two works just mentioned recalls the name of a man whose memory will be revered as long as a surviving friend remains, and whose labours will be appreciated as long as learning is cultivated among us. It was the last, it was indeed the dying work of Dr. Elmsley; of whom, if of any person, it may be said with truth, *Multis ille bonis flebilis occidit.* The death of Dr. Elmsley has left that regret among his friends, which learning alone, if unaccompanied with warmer and finer feelings, could never have called forth. They lamented him as an accurate critic and a profound and elegant scholar; but they reflect with more painful sensations upon the charm of his conversation and the gentleness and goodness of his heart.

Dr. Elmsley was a man who won the affections of his friends, and conciliated the respect of all, more powerfully perhaps than any person whose reputation has been raised so high. Known as he was throughout Europe, and esteemed, if not the first, certainly among the first, of Greek scholars, he had neither the pride, nor the pedantry, nor the jealousy, which too often mark the characters of men who are otherwise great. To say that he was affable to all, would not express the manner in which he was ever willing to communicate knowledge. When he was con-

versing with an inferior, there was no appearance of condescension: he had the art of making all persons delight in his conversation, and without appearing to dictate or to monopolize discourse he was constantly referred to as authority upon every subject; and it seldom happened that he could not satisfy the inquirer. His memory was most surprizingly retentive; and fond as he was of examining into every subject, and possessing a delicacy and discrimination of taste which are not often combined with profound erudition, he was welcome every where as an amusing, as well as an instructive, companion. Nor let it be forgotten, that amidst his favourite pursuit of classical learning he had not neglected to draw from those living waters, of which he that drinketh shall never thirst. And those who can recollect when the same harmonious tones, which they had heard with delight in his social hours, were transferred to the House of God, and there employed in conjunction with his stores of knowledge and his elegance of style, will bear witness that the picture which has been attempted to be drawn, so far from being too highly coloured, falls sadly short of the worth and excellence of the original.

But we must confine ourselves at present to his labours in classical literature. Dr. Elmsley may truly be said to have been ἀπτικώτατος; and as an editor of Greek Plays, he perhaps held the first place in combining critical rules with explanations of the author's meaning. It is observed by him, in his preface to the *Medea*, that the duty of an editor consists in two things; in correcting the text of the author, and interpreting his meaning. Of these two duties, he remarks that Porson executed the former so successfully, as to leave little hope of many improved readings being given; but as to the latter, with the exception of a few occasional and cursory remarks, he altogether neglected it. In the same preface he complains that this play, though so well deserving to have its beauties understood, had hitherto received very little illustration from any editor; and he continues:

“ I conceive therefore that my pains will be well bestowed, if I attempt what other persons have declined, and follow the same method in illustrating the *Medea* of Euripides, which Valcknaer and Markland pursued in editing three other of his plays. There is one thing however, which is allowed to all scholars who labour to advance critical learning, and which I hope will not be refused to me,—I mean, that I may take advantage of any passage in the poet which I am editing, to correct or explain other passages in his works or elsewhere, to propose new rules of construction or to confirm old ones, in short, to say whatever I please which is connected with this department, and which does not draw me off too far from the matter before me.”

In his preface to the *Heraclidæ* he explains another part of his system, in the following words:—

“ With respect to the notes, I shall perhaps receive some thanks from my readers for bringing together, and inserting in my annotations, whatever I found in Brodæus, Barnes, Heath, and Musgrave, which was likely to illustrate the play; and I conceive that the learned men, whose writings I have thus copied, would not think themselves ill-used, if I have not only omitted many of their erroneous interpretations and unfortunate conjectures, but have pruned and abridged some of their notes, which were in themselves extremely good, but rather too wordy for the taste of the present day. In some cases also, when they quoted from old writers, I have given the citations in rather an altered form, and have generally adopted the references to the pages and lines of the editions which I have used myself.”

Such were the rules which Dr. Elmsley followed in editing his Greek plays; and they seem to combine almost every thing which is wanted to render a commentary useful and instructive. The liberty which he claims, of saying any thing which he pleases, if he can give it a connexion with the passage before him, may evidently be abused, and may lead to endless digressions; but before we bring this objection, we should see whether the use which Dr. Elmsley makes of this privilege has led him into the fault just mentioned:—upon the whole, we think that it has not. We do not mean to say that his digressions are not sometimes too long, and his conclusions too hastily drawn—of which more hereafter; but the rule, when properly applied, is confessedly a good one; and if Dr. Elmsley should lead other critics, particularly those of our own country, to follow his example, he will have rendered an essential service to classical learning.

Our readers will perhaps not complain, if, previous to noticing the particular work before us, we give some account of Dr. Elmsley's critical labours; and we will now proceed to mention, in their order, the different editions of Greek plays which he published.

The earliest of his works of this kind was the *Acharnenses* of Aristophanes, which was printed at Oxford in 1809. When Kuster published his edition of this author in 1710, he only added the readings of one MS. which was in the Vatican; and these were considered by Dr. Elmsley not to have been very important. Brunck consulted three MSS. in the King's Library at Paris for his edition, which appeared in 1783: one of these is supposed to be of considerable antiquity; but by far the most valuable MS. of Aristophanes was that which was preserved at Ravenna, and which unfortunately fell into the hands of Invernizius. This editor, who had before been a lawyer, not only

adopted many of Brunck's conjectural readings and admitted them into the text, but with a scrupulous fidelity, as Elmsley quaintly observes, reprinted almost all the errors which Brunck had inadvertently suffered to remain. Thus the excellence of the Ravenna MS. was materially diminished; at least it became extremely difficult to distinguish its real and peculiar readings. Dr. Elmsley endeavoured to remedy this defect; and this constitutes the principal merit of his edition. The notes are not so full of general criticism as those which he wrote later in life: they are printed under the text, except a few, which he called *Auctarium Annotationum*, which appear at the end. This book is now very scarce, and perhaps not to be bought; for not long after it had been published, Dr. Elmsley, for some reason or other, became dissatisfied with it, and called in all the copies which he could find.

In 1811 he published the *Œdipus Tyrannus* of Sophocles. He informs us in the preface, that his original intention had been to let his annotations hold a kind of middle place between the copiousness of Valcknaer and the brevity of Porson; but being disappointed in some materials which he had hoped to have possessed, (the nature of which he does not exactly explain,) he compressed his work into a smaller form than he had at first proposed. The only MSS. which he personally consulted, were three in the Bodleian library at Oxford, and one in that of Trinity College, Cambridge. He speaks of having examined about thirty editions of this play; and at the bottom of each page, in his own edition, he printed the various readings of six of them, which he considered to be the best; viz. those of Aldus, Junta (2d.), Turnebus, Stephens, Brunck (3d.), and Erfurdt. His notes, which are more concise than to any other play which he published, are also at the bottom of the page. He gave notice, at the conclusion of the preface, of an intention to edit all the plays of Sophocles in the same manner; and the admirers of that poet, as well as every classical scholar, must deeply regret that he did not carry this project into effect.

In the year 1813 appeared at Oxford an edition of the *Hæclicidæ* of Euripides. At the bottom of each page are printed the various readings of the Aldine edition, and of that edition only; and the learned editor stated, that every variation, not only of single letters but even of accents and spirits, had been noticed. The readings of other MSS. are mentioned in the notes. These annotations, which are printed at the end of the text, are extended to a greater length than any which he had hitherto published; and combining as they do the most valuable observations of former editors and a vast store of general criticism, they cannot be

read without great advantage, either as a commentary upon the play or as a separate work. Some additional notes are given as a supplement, which have been incorporated with the former ones in a reprint of this play, which was published by Dindorf, in 1821, at Leipsic.

The *Medea* of Euripides, which appeared in 1818, was edited much in the same manner with the *Heraclidæ*. Dr. Elmsley had published some of the notes in the *Museum Criticum*, in 1815; but in 1818 he republished them at Oxford, together with the text and several alterations and additions. The annotations are at the end; and those which are purely critical, and most unconnected with the immediate subject, are placed at the bottom of the page. The readings of the Aldine edition are printed under the text. Since the publication of the *Heraclidæ* Dr. Elmsley had visited Italy; and at Rome as well as at Florence he employed his time as might have been expected of so profound and accurate a scholar. In the preface to the *Medea* he gives an account of five MSS. containing this play, which he consulted in the Vatican. He considered the most valuable of these to be the one which he marked A, and which is probably of the twelfth century. It contains the seven first plays of Euripides, the *Troades*, and also the *Rhesus*: and our readers may judge of the industry and fidelity of Dr. Elmsley, when they learn that he twice collated this MS. with the Aldine edition of the *Medea*, and noted down all the various readings; at the same time he wishes it to be understood, that he did not collate all the five Vatican MSS. with the same care. The various readings of several other MSS. are also noticed in this edition; so that, in a critical point of view, the text of the play was exhibited in a much more perfect state than it had ever assumed before. This edition was reprinted at Leipsic in 1822 by Herman, who added at the end some annotations of his own, which had appeared in the *Classical Journal*, and some very useful indices.

The *Medea* was followed by the *Bacchæ*, which was published in 1821. This play also profited by Dr. Elmsley's foreign journey. He informs us in the preface, that he only knew of five MSS. being in existence which contained the *Bacchæ*,—one in the Vatican, two in the Laurentian library at Florence, and two in the King's library at Paris. Dr. Elmsley consulted all these MSS.; but he considerably reduces their value by stating, that the later of the two Florentine, and both the Paris MSS. are copies of the older Florentine; so that in fact there are only two original or independent MSS. of the play, and both of these are imperfect: it may be added, that neither of them is older than the fourteenth century. Still, however, scanty as this editorial supel-

lex must be considered, Dr. Elmsley has purified the text in no small degree; and he honestly professes that he ventured to think his own edition superior to any other. Many of the errors which the Aldine edition contained, and which it was hopeless to attempt to remove by conjecture, were corrected by means of the Roman and Florentine MSS.; but it is mortifying to find the learned and indefatigable editor acknowledging, after all his pains, that the hopes which he had once entertained were by no means realized, and that he had never undertaken any labour of that kind which turned out less satisfactory. The reason which he assigns is, that the play is full of such invincible difficulties and corruptions, that no learning or sagacity, unassisted by farther materials, could possibly surmount them. The notes, as usual, are critical and explanatory; they are printed under the text, with a few *addenda* at the end: and by way of appendix, we have a separate collation of the Aldine edition, and an unpublished life of Euripides, taken from a MS. in the Ambrosian library at Milan.

We mentioned, that when Dr. Elmsley published his edition of the *Œdipus Tyrannus*, he signified his intention of editing in succession all the plays of Sophocles. He probably did not entirely abandon this idea; and in 1823 he published the *Œdipus Coloneus*, with a more copious commentary than any which he had yet written upon the former plays. In the preface he mentions having made use of ten MSS. in preparing this edition; and we are perhaps to understand that he had collated the greater part of them himself. There can be little doubt that this was the case with four which were preserved at Florence; for since the publication of the *Bacchæ* he had again visited that place, as well as Rome. The play, with the notes, forms a volume of 368 pages; and he appears to have emptied his common-place-book more profusely than upon any other occasion; and perhaps there never was an edition of any author in which more pains were taken in enumerating the various readings, and settling the text.

The illness, which finally brought him to the grave, had already produced its effect upon the constitution and the energies of this highly-gifted scholar. For a time his favourite pursuits were almost suspended; and he lived only to superintend one more publication, which was a new edition of his *Œdipus Tyrannus*. The first appeared, as stated above, in 1811. It had subsequently been reprinted in Germany with considerable additions, both from the collations of MSS. and the notes of different scholars. Dr. Elmsley republished these additions in 1825, but he expressly states that there was nothing new of his own except what was contained in the preface. “*Quo minus annotationem poetæ*

verbis subjectam emendarem, obstitit adversa valetudo, qua diu laboravi. Postea vero quam Dei O. M. beneficio convalescere cæpi, conatus sum graviore meos errores tollere." The piety of these words was as characteristic of Dr. Elmsley as the zeal with which he returned to his former labours. Though he states that this third edition contained nothing which was not in the first and second, except the preface, yet this alone gives a considerable value to the book, since it contains a collation of three MSS. in the Laurentian library at Florence. There are also at the end three very useful indices, which were added by the German editor; 1st, of the authors quoted, and 2d, of words which, in a critical point of view, contain any thing remarkable.

We have thus given a short and imperfect sketch of the different editions of Greek plays published by Dr. Elmsley. The fullest and most detailed review of his critical labours is that which was written by Herman, and appeared in Nos. XXXVIII, XLII, and XLIV, of the *Classical Journal*, and was republished by Herman himself, together with a conclusion of the critique, when Elmsley's *Medea* was reprinted at Leipsic. In this article there is a great mixture of praise and censure; nor are we disposed to say that the latter is in every instance unfounded. Herman gives great credit to Elmsley for his unwearied diligence and scrupulous accuracy in enumerating various readings: he also speaks in commendation of his minute grammatical knowledge, and confesses the value of many of his emendations. He adds, however, (and nearly the whole of the review is intended as a demonstration of the assertion,) that he cannot approve of the practice, so extravagantly pursued by Elmsley, of digressing from the subject before him, to discuss general topics of criticism or construction: he thinks that he was too fond of laying down grammatical canons, many of which are erroneous; and he charges him with venturing to correct passages in other authors without mature consideration. If we were called upon to give an opinion, we should have no hesitation in deciding, that an editor, particularly the editor of a Greek play, may with great advantage to his readers introduce general criticism into his notes. The limits to be put to this practice must necessarily vary; but when Herman lays it down as the sole and exclusive business of an editor to make his commentary turn upon the passage before him, and to confine himself to the explanation of that passage, we are decidedly at issue with him. The knowledge of a Porson or an Elmsley can only be obtained by a perusal of many contemporary writers; and if by editing a single Greek play these scholars can put their readers in possession of knowledge which they themselves acquired by studying several plays, such information is surely not to be with-

held. We would contend against Herman, or any critic of the German school, that no person, who makes pretensions to scholarship, should read a Greek play with the sole view of understanding the meaning of the words, or even the beauties of the poetry: at least, if he can pass over these best and purest models of Attic Greek, without wishing to know something of the rules of composition, he is not fit to read poetry at all. That Dr. Elmsley sometimes digressed too far from his subject, we are ready to allow; neither do we deny that he was rather too fond of generalizing and laying down rules, some of which, as Herman says, he would have wished afterwards to retract. But still this does not affect the principle for which we are contending. Of an hundred persons who read the *Œdipus Tyrannus*, or the *Medea*, perhaps only one would have the curiosity to compare it with other plays, or the talent or the memory to institute this comparison with effect: but when he meets with an observation or canon laid down by the editor, he may be able to see the force of it; and though he would not have discovered it himself, he may try the accuracy of it as he pursues his reading. It is thus that the notes of Dr. Elmsley are so interesting and useful, not only to the more advanced scholar, but to the first beginner. His mind seems to have been perpetually at work to dive into the principles of the Greek language; and his astonishing memory enabled him to accumulate and combine so many parallel instances, that he was always discovering some new rules which he fancied to have been followed by the Attic writers. This led him undoubtedly to make assertions which were hasty and unsupported: he has himself pointed out the errors of some of his own rules, and future critics will perhaps have to prove that others are untenable. But where much is attempted, some defects must necessarily appear. This critical legislation, if we may use the expression, was the peculiar characteristic of Elmsley; he has perhaps laid down more canons for the writing of Attic Greek than any other scholar; and we doubt whether Bentley himself has suggested more emendations of ancient authors.

The limits of the present article will not allow us to enter into a discussion of these canons; but it would be an essential service to criticism, if they could all be brought together into one view; and it may be interesting to our readers to know that, beside the editions enumerated above, Dr. Elmsley was the author of the following articles in different periodical publications. A review of Markland's *Supplices*, in the *Quarterly Review*, No. XIV.; of Wyttienbach's *Plutarch*, in the *Edinburgh Review*, No. III.; of Heyne's *Homer*, No. IV.; of Sweighæuser's *Athenæus*, No. V.; of Blomfield's *Prometheus*, No. XXXIII.; of Porson's *Hecuba*,

No. XXXVII.; Classical Criticism, in the *Classical Journal*, No. IX., p. 179; the same in No. X., p. 334, and in No. XI., p. 221; a Dissertation upon the date of the *Clouds* of Aristophanes, No. XI.; a Review of Herman's *Hercules Furens*, No. XV.; of Herman's *Supplices*, No. XVI., XVII.; Notes on the *Ajax*, in the *Museum Criticum*, No. III., IV.; a Review of Porson's *Medea*, No. V., of Seidler's *Iphigenia in Tauris*, No. VI., and of Blomfield's *Agamemnon*, No. VII.

We do not pretend to give this as a complete list of Dr. Elmsley's critical works; but we have reason to believe that the accuracy of it may be depended upon; and it may assist any person who would attempt the task, recommended above, of making an *Elmsleiana*, or a collection of Elmsley's critical canons. We may add, that the articles which he furnished for these different Reviews, are written in a strain of pleasantry and classical humour, which takes from them all the dryness and technical pedantry which are so common in works of that kind. It is impossible to read them without being highly amused: we would undertake to say, that no person will look through any one of them without smiling to himself; and when he has finished it, he will perhaps have picked up more information than he ever received from the same number of pages of the most learned and serious discussion.

Professor Herman has alarmed himself with thinking that the English nation was proceeding to pay the same homage to Elmsley which it had paid to Porson, and to receive his dicta as law with an obedience equally servile. But perhaps the cautions which he has given did not arise altogether from a love of literary freedom. It is well known that Porson derided Herman in no measured or qualified terms. The German had undoubtedly a right to feel angry; he was treated uncourteously, and we cannot say that he has spoken worse of Porson than might have been expected. But Elmsley also delivered his opinion of Herman in a manner which could not have been very pleasing to that scholar; and in a review of Herman's edition of the *Hercules Furens*, written by Elmsley, we may perhaps find a clue to the tone of censure and disparagement in which the German critic speaks of long notes and rash emendations. It is there said, among other matters, that

"Mr. Herman is best known in England by his work on Greek and Latin metres; a book of which too much ill cannot easily be said, and which contains a smaller quantity of useful and solid information, in proportion to its bulk, than any elementary treatise, on any subject, which we remember to have seen."

Again,—

"The edition of the *Hercules Furens*, which we have lately received,

has disappointed us. This disappointment indeed is in some measure our own fault. As we expected, without sufficient grounds, a volume of respectable size and thickness, we have certainly no just reason to be dissatisfied at receiving a thin and diminutive pamphlet. The editor of a Greek author has an undoubted right to make his commentary as concise and as jejune as he pleases, provided that he actually performs all that he professes to perform."

Now when this number of the Classical Journal arrived in Germany, it cannot be supposed that Professor Herman felt flattered; and since he could not complain of Elmsley for being "concise and jejune," he very naturally retorted upon him for being irrelevant and prolix. Elmsley also finds fault with Herman for so seldom correcting the text, and for taking no notice of emendations made by others. We have seen that Herman held Elmsley up to censure for erring in the opposite extreme. But it is impossible to read the pungent and galling sarcasm with which the English critic ridicules the antistrophic mania of the German school, without seeing at once that Herman must have felt extremely sore. Obstinate and self-complacent as he may have been, still he must have said to himself,

pudet hæc opprobria nobis
Et dici potuisse et non potuisse refelli.

We are much mistaken, if many expressions in Herman's critique upon Elmsley may not be accounted for upon this principle of retaliation. It is somewhat singular that he caused it to be inserted in the very same journal, which had contained the reflections upon his own critical labours; and so scrupulous was he in attempting to neutralize the triumph of his reviewer, that since the articles written against himself extended through three numbers, he made his own review of the *Medea* divide into as many parts, καὶ τύπος ἀντίτυπος, καὶ πῆμ' ἐπὶ πῆματι κεῖται. We cannot however resist copying the following sentence, which closes the review written by Herman: every syllable of it gave us pleasure as we read it; and we could hardly have thought that any person could have done such justice to Dr. Elmsley's character, who had not known him intimately, and lived with him as a friend.

"Itaque tantum abest ut dissentiendo minuere laudem viri præstantissimi voluerimus, ut eum et ipsi valde admiremur, et dignum in primis putemus quem audiant omnes. Est enim P. Elmsleius, si quis alius, vir natus augendæ accuratiori Græcæ linguæ cognitioni, ut cujus eximia ac plane singularis in pervestigandis rebus grammaticis diligentia regatur præclaro ingenio, mente ab auctoritatibus libera, animo veri amantissimo, neque aut superbia, aut gloriæ studio, aut obtrectandi cupiditate præpedito. His ille virtutibus id est consequutus, ut, quum doctrinæ ejus

maximi facienda sit, non minus ipse sit amandus atque venerandus. Ea autem maxima est et non interitura laus, non utilem tantum, sed etiam bonum virum esse."

We have given above a list of the different critical works which Dr. Elmsley published in his life-time; but he was cut off by death in the midst of another work, which must always be considered of first-rate importance by the editors of *Sophocles*. When he was at Florence in 1820, he transcribed from a MS. in the Laurentian library, what are known by scholars under the name of the Roman Scholia, from having been first published at Rome in 1518. It is stated by Fabricius, (and copied probably from him by Harwood,) that an edition of *Sophocles*, together with the Scholia, was printed in this year. But the statement is certainly incorrect. The Scholia were printed by themselves; and the volume, independent of its contents, is deserving of notice, as being the second Greek book which issued from the press established in Rome under the auspices of Leo X. This munificent pontiff, however, has not the credit of being the first to establish a Greek press in Rome. The merit of this undertaking must be assigned to a private individual, Agostino Chigi, who invited Zach. Caliergus, a learned Cretan, to remove from Venice to Rome; and appointing him superintendent of a new press, he caused the works of Pindar to be published in 1515. This was the first Greek book printed in Rome. Greek types had been used in that city at an earlier period; for Sweynheim and Pannartz, in 1469, published an edition of Aulus Gellius, in which the Greek words that occur are printed in a fair character, without accents or spirits. But the merit of establishing a Greek press in Rome must be attributed, as stated above, to Agostino Chigi. The Pope soon followed his example. The Gymnasium, or Academy, which had existed before, was revived under his auspices; and John Lascar, who had been employed by Lorenzo de' Medici to collect MSS. in Greece, was invited by Leo to superintend a Greek press on the Monte Cavallo. The first work which was printed was the Scholia upon Homer, which appeared in 1517; and the Scholia upon *Sophocles* followed in the year after. The volume is a small quarto, with no printer's name—there is, in fact, no title-page; and it has sometimes been said that Caliergus was the printer. But this is probably a mistake. Caliergus, as stated above, was in the employment of Agostino Chigi; and it is well known that the press on the Monte Cavallo was under the superintendence of Lascar. It is to the latter scholar, therefore, that we must assign the publication of the Scholia upon *Sophocles*. They were taken from a MS. containing the works of that tragedian, which still exists in the Lauren-

tian library at Florence; and the fact of their being published at Rome, as well as of their being published at all without the plays to which they belong, can easily be explained. The *editio princeps* of Sophocles was printed by Aldus, in 1502, at Venice. John Lascar was then residing in that city. Aldus dedicated the book to him; and among other things he states, that the Scholia which had been lately discovered were not yet printed, but that, if God preserved his life, they should be printed very soon. Aldus died in 1515, and for some reason or other he never fulfilled his promise of printing the Scholia as a companion to his edition of Sophocles. It was therefore very natural that Lascar, as soon as he was established at Rome, should undertake the work; and the tragedies themselves being dedicated to him would make him still more interested in publishing the Scholia. Whether Aldus alluded to the Scholia which are contained in the Florentine MS. can perhaps never be ascertained. It is most probable that he did; but even if he did not, a pope of the Medici family would be likely to know the contents of the library at Florence, and Lascar would not lose much time in having the MS., as soon as he heard of its existence, brought to Rome.

Such is the history of the first publication of the Roman Scholia upon Sophocles. The learned have not yet succeeded, and probably never will succeed, in ascertaining who was the author of them. They have been ascribed, but without any foundation, to Sophocles the grammarian, Theo, and other persons; but all that can be stated concerning them is, that they form the oldest commentary upon this tragedian which is known to exist. The handwriting shows that they were not added by the person who transcribed the plays themselves; but those who are judges of these matters have given it as their opinion, that they were written about the same time. Almost every subsequent editor of Sophocles has reprinted these Scholia; and generally with many corrections, alterations, and interpolations. Not only the first edition of 1518, but the MS. itself, from which they were taken, contains many palpable errors and corruptions; from which it is plain, that they were not the observations of the person who transcribed them in the MS., but that they were taken from some older document, which was copied inaccurately. Most editors therefore have taken the liberty of correcting these mistakes according to their own conjectures: Scholia from other MSS. were not unfrequently incorporated with the first; so that nothing but a collation of every successive edition would enable us to detect the additions which had been made from time to time. Brunck was aware of the altered and interpolated state to which the Roman Scholia were reduced; and in his own edition of Sophocles, which ap-

peared in 1786, he had recourse to the original one of 1518, and, in many instances, he has corrected the errors very judiciously. Brunck was certainly deserving of praise for thus reverting to the original edition; but Dr. Elmsley has now proved, that the first publisher of the Scholia took as many liberties, in departing from his copy, as any of the numerous editors who have followed him; so that though Brunck has for the most part followed Lascar's edition, he has by no means printed the Scholia such as they appear in the Florence MS.

We are not aware that any scholar had taken the trouble of copying them from the original MS. since the time of their being first published. Dr. Elmsley, with that unwearied diligence which was so remarkable in him as being coupled with so much elegance of mind, accomplished this task; and the transcript which he made has been laid up, where, we trust, that it will for ever be preserved, in the Bodleian library at Oxford. The fruits of this labour have now been given to the world; and in the volume before us we possess the Roman Scholia in a much more perfect form than they have ever yet assumed in print. No one, indeed, who at all knew the accuracy of Dr. Elmsley, can doubt but that the printed book is as faithful a copy of the original MS. as could be ever expected to be made.

The short preface to this edition, which is written by Professor Gaisford, informs us of the circumstances under which it was published. Dr. Elmsley, upon his return to England, did not immediately prepare to print the Scholia. His health, which soon began rapidly to decline, made him still more unfit for such a troublesome office; and it was not till a few weeks before his death, when he enjoyed a short but delusive respite from his illness, and began again to apply to his favourite pursuits, that Mr. Gaisford renewed the subject of the Roman Scholia. It was important that they should at least be begun under his auspices; and with a most commendable zeal for the cause of literature, as well as from a sincere regard for his suffering friend, Mr. Gaisford undertook to correct the sheets himself, as they passed through the press. The offer was immediately accepted; the work was sent to the press without delay; and Dr. Elmsley, though then rapidly sinking, had the satisfaction to see some of the sheets completed before his death. When that melancholy event happened, about sixty-four pages were printed; and from thence to the end of the volume the whole care of superintending the edition was sustained by Mr. Gaisford. We have thus the greatest security for the work being faithfully and accurately performed. Seldom perhaps have two scholars of equal celebrity been united in the same task; and it is seldom also, that two men, so eminent in the

same department of literature, have lived in the same circle, not only without jealousy, but in habits of close and intimate friendship.

It might be expected from what has been said above, that this edition of the Scholia would differ very widely from all which have preceded it. We have also stated that the original MS. is by no means free from errors. Some of the Scholia are so abbreviated or corrupted as to be wholly unintelligible: in many cases it is easy to correct the grammatical blunders of the transcriber; but in others we must have recourse to conjecture alone in eliciting the true reading. The reader therefore is not to suppose, that the present edition is an exact copy, *verbatim* and *literatim*, of the Florence MS. To have printed it in this way would have been of little use, except to allow critical scholars to exercise their own ingenuity and sagacity. But the general readers of Sophocles will be much better pleased to find the text of the Scholia exhibited in that form, which at least presents an intelligible sense; grammatical errors are corrected; and where the writer, from ignorance or carelessness, put in a wrong word, another is substituted, which is either demonstrably the true one, or agrees with the context. In most cases the real reading of the MS. is given in a note; and the variations introduced by the Roman editor and by Brunck, as well as the peculiar readings of Triclinius, are also carefully marked. The collation of these various readings must have been a very tedious and laborious work: and without dwelling any longer upon the plan pursued by the editor, we will state one material benefit resulting from an examination having been made of the original MS. If we look to Brunck's edition of the Scholia, we find that every explanation of a passage has the words prefixed to it, printed in capital letters, which it professes to explain. Brunck informs us, that he had faithfully copied these words, which are placed at the head of each scholium, from the original edition of 1518; for since Lascar must have taken these words from the MS. in which the Scholia were written, by having them accurately copied from Lascar's edition we gain so many genuine readings of the Florence MS. All this sounds very well; and any person would imagine, that these *lemmata*, as they are called, which Brunck printed in capital letters, are *so many genuine readings of the Florence MS.* But Brunck might have spared himself this trouble. Dr. Elmsley's collation of the original MS. has made us acquainted with the fact, that the Roman editor did not always print these *lemmata* from the words which he found in the text, but often adopted other readings, either from conjecture, or which he has taken from other copies. Thus the conclusions of learned editors, who

have founded their interpretations or corrections of the text of Sophocles upon these lemmata, as supposing them to be taken from an ancient MS., are in some cases entirely destroyed. It appears that the Scholia have not always any lemmata prefixed to them, but the reader is to judge from the terms of the commentary to what particular words of the text it applies. In most cases this application is very evident; but sometimes it is not so easy to refer the Scholia to their proper place. In the edition now before us, a method is adopted of prefixing the lemmata, which prevents any misconception in this particular. Where they existed in the MS. the editor has separated them from the explanation by a colon :, but where he had to supply them from conjecture, he has placed a bracket] immediately after them. In these latter instances the lemmata will frequently be found to differ from those which were printed by Lascar and by Brunck; but as far as we have observed, these alterations have not been made without sufficient reason; and an inspection of the original MS. has naturally led to the removal of many errors, which could not have been detected while the Scholia were in their former corrupt and interpolated state.

From what has been said, it will appear plain that this edition of the Roman Scholia greatly excels every other in value. It is in fact the only faithful and accurate edition which ever has been made: for the first editor, as stated above, introduced many alterations of his own; and nearly all his successors have thought themselves at liberty to do the same. We do not however wish to deprive Brunck of the merit which is due to him. It must be acknowledged, that he published a much more critical edition of the Scholia than any person who had gone before him; and not having the original MS. to consult, he perhaps could not have done better. His corrections and substitutions are frequently very judicious, and in the present edition they are sometimes adopted in preference to the reading which was found in the MS. It appears also from Dr. Elmsley's transcript, that the Roman editor not only made alterations, but omitted several of the Scholia. In the present edition they are all faithfully restored; and there is scarcely a page in which the notes do not inform us of some of these omissions. It is true that in many cases the commentary is of little or no use; but no scholar would allow this to be a reason for not inserting them all; and in those instances where the lemmata are prefixed, it is very essential that they should be printed, because they give us the genuine reading of an ancient MS.

We will now produce some examples of the use which may be made of this edition in a critical point of view. If we were to give an account of all the errors which it corrects, and the new

scholia, which are now printed for the first time, we should have to transcribe the greater part of every page. We shall therefore confine ourselves to a few of the most striking instances, and particularly to those, where the mistakes and unfounded conjectures of the editors of Sophocles are exposed by an inspection of this authentic copy of the Scholia. The verses referred to in Dr. Elmsley's edition are the same as those in Brunck's.

ŒDIPUS TYRANNUS.

25. We have here an instance how one mistake leads to another. The Roman editor printed the Scholium upon the words φθίνουσα μὲν κάλυξιν thus, σὺν τοῖς βλαστήμασιν, οὐ μόνον ἀφορίαν φησὶν εἶναι τῆς γῆς ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς πεφηκότας καρποὺς διαφθεῖρεσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ λοιμοῦ. The Florence edition of 1522 altered πεφηκότας into πεφυκότας, which is adopted by Brunck. The true reading, which Elmsley has restored, is πεφηνότας.
46. The last words of the Scholium in Brunck's edition is εἶ διαγεγόναι, but the true reading is ἐν εὐδία γεγόναμεν.
287. The lemma in Brunck's edition is ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν ἀργοῖς, which is probably the true reading; but in the MS. it is ἐναργῶς, which has been altered to ἐν ἀργοῖς.
347. The lemma in Lascar's and Brunck's edition is ὅσον μὴ χερὶ, which might be quoted as a various reading; but in the MS. it is abbreviated, thus χ, which undoubtedly meant χερσὶ, as we find it in the text.
979. Lascar and Brunck read καλὸν τὸ ζῆν ἀλόγως, which conveys no meaning; the true reading is καλὸν τὸ ζῆν ἀσφαλῶς, which also is not very intelligible.
1062. Brunck reads τρίτον πεπραμένος καὶ αὐτὸς τρίπρατος. The true reading alters the sense very materially, and makes the expression much stronger, τρίτον πεπραμένης καὶ αὐτὸς τρίπρατος.
1321. The MS. has a Scholium, which is omitted by Brunck, and which contains a various reading, not noticed (we believe) in any edition: the words are γρ. καὶ ἐμοῖς ἐπὶ πόνοις, which is evidently a substitution for ἐμὸς ἐπίπολος.

ŒDIPUS COLONEUS.

84. The lemma in Lascar's and Brunck's editions is ὦ πότνι' ὦ δεινῶπες, which seems to be a various reading of ὦ πότνια δεινῶπες, and so it is printed in the text of the second Junta. But there is no foundation whatever for the reading: in the MS. there is no lemma at all, and the reading in the text is distinctly ὦ πότνια δεινῶπες.
98. The Scholium upon this verse is omitted by Lascar and Brunck; but it is of importance on account of the two readings, ὁδοιπόρων and ὁδοιπορῶν. The Scholiast evidently preferred the former: his words are οὐ γὰρ ἂν ποτε τῶν ἄλλων ὁδοιπορῶν πρώταις ὑμῖν ἀντίσχον, εἰ μὴ βούλησθε. The MS. originally read ὁδοιπορῶν, and though the former accent has been erased and the latter retained, it is evident that the Scholiast meant to read ὁδοιπόρων.

113. We mention this instance to show how the carelessness of the Roman editor made nonsense of the passage: he printed the scholium thus, ἵνα μὴ πρὸς τούτους ὁ χόρος προπυθνομένους γένηται. Brunck made it a little better by reading προπυθνο-νόμενος; but the MS. has ἵνα μὴ πρὸς τούτους προπυθνομένους ὁ λόγος γένηται.
153. We have here another instance of alterations and corruptions. Lascar printed ἔάν τις ἀγνοῦντα τινὰ καὶ μὴ βαίνοντα τόπον ἄβατον—Brunck altered μὴ βαίνοντα to ἐμβαίνοντα. The true reading is μαίνοντα.
166. The Roman editor entirely omitted to mention that οἷσεις is given by the Scholiast as a various reading for ἔχεις. See Elmsley in his edition of the O. C.
238. Lascar and Brunck give γεραὸν ἢ ἀλαὸν as the lemma to the Scholium ἐκ τοῦ ἐπιθέτου νέυει εἰς τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς ἀπολογία, which makes nonsense. The Scholium evidently refers to ἀκόντων.
243. The lemma is distinctly οὐ κάλοῖς, and not οὐκ ἀλαοῖς as Brunck has printed it from the Roman edition.
443. Brunck explains ἔπους σμικροῦ χάριν to mean, that the sons of Œdipus would not exert themselves so much as to speak even a few words in his behalf. The Scholium upon the place, which is omitted by Lascar, and consequently by Brunck, remarkably confirms this interpretation, οἶον, ἀντιλογίας βραχείας ἔδει ποιήσασθαι αὐτοὺς ὑπὲρ τοῦ πατρὸς διωκομένου τῶν Θηβῶν.
837. We have here a striking instance of the liberty taken by the Roman editor in altering or omitting. Upon the word πόλει he printed this Scholium, ταῖς Ἀθήναις δηλονότι. But the MS. expressly reads, ταῖς Θήβαις, which shows that the writer of the Scholium meant to put this speech into the mouth of Creon. Reisigius had already proposed this alteration.
858. Here also the MS. reads ταῖς Θήβαις, which is altered by Lascar to ταῖς Ἀθήναις.
1077. Turnebus gives πολλὰ in the margin as a various reading for δεινὰ. There can be no doubt that he took this from the Roman edition of the Scholia, where the lemma is τὰν πολλὰ τλαῖσαν. But the MS. reads without any lemma τὴν πολλὰ δὲ ἀνατλαῖσαν, which Triclinius altered, not without reason, to τὴν πολλὰ δεινὰ τλαῖσαν. So that the various reading of Turnebus has no foundation whatever.
1173. We are obliged in fairness to notice this instance, because it shows the Scholiast to have been, as Elmsley observes, incredibly stupid. He connected the nominative πᾶς οὐμὸς with the vocative ὦναξ, as appears from the Scholium, πρὸς τὸν Θησέα φησὶν ὧδε παῖδα αὐτὸν κέκληκεν. The Roman editor, with more charity than fairness, omitted the latter part of the note.

ANTIGONE.

140. Δεξιόσειρος, which is the lemma in the Roman edition, is probably right; the MS. reads δεξιόχειρος, as it does in the text;

but Elmsley considered this to have been a correction of the Scholiast, or of the person who added the Scholia.

264. The following sentence is omitted by the Roman editor, *τοῦτο μέχρι τῆς σήμερον οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι ποιοῦσιν Ἑλληνικῶς, πλανώμενοι καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις πλείστοις*. We cannot be surprised that Pope Leo's printer suppressed this passage.
316. Lascar and Brunck give *οὐκ οἶσθα καὶ νῦν* as the lemma: but it appears, as Elmsley observes, that the Scholiast meant to read *εἶσθα*, since his comment is, *ἀπὸ θι καὶ νῦν γὰρ λέγων ἀνιάρως μοι εἶ*. There is no lemma in the MS.

TRACHINIE.

327. Lascar and Brunck printed the Scholium *ἔρημον, ὑψηλὴν, ἦν Ὅμηρος ἠνεμοέσσαν φησιν*. Hence Brunck proposed to read *ἠνεμάεσσόν* for *Οἰχαλίης* in II. β. 730, *οἳ τ' ἔχον Οἰχαλίην, πόλιν Εὐρύτου ἠνεμοέσσαν*. But the relative *ἦν* is not in the MS., and the Scholiast did not mean that Homer applied the epithet *ἠνεμόεσσαν* to Œchalia, but that the term *ἐνένημον*, which is used by Sophocles, is the same with the Homeric word *ἠνεμόεσσαν*.
339. The lemma in the MS. is *τοῦ με τήνδ' ἐφίστασαι βάσιν*, and so Brunck printed it: but the Roman editor altered *με* into *κε*, upon the strength of which reading Porson (ad Phœn. 1373), proposed *τοῦ καὶ τήνδ' ἐφίστασαι βάσιν*; but as Gaisford well observes, "lectione codicis patefacta, corrui Porsoni emendatio."
497. We notice this, because it is said in the note that Lascar and Brunck omit the gloss *μέγα τι σθένουσα* for *μέγα τι σθένος ἄ*. But Brunck has the words in his edition, though he puts them at the beginning of the Scholium instead of at the end of it.

AJAX.

571. Brunck reads *μέχρις οὔ* instead of *μέχρις ἂν*, and quotes the authority of the Scholia; and in his own edition, as in the Roman, we find *μέχρις οὔ μυχοῦς κίχῳσι* as the lemma; but there is no such lemma in the MS.
579. Brunck observes that the false reading *καὶ δῶμ' ἀπάκτου* has been supported upon the authority of the old Scholiast, who gave *ἄπαγε* as his interpretation; but that this is an interpolation of Francinus, who superintended the second Junta edition of Sophocles. Brunck is however mistaken. The MS. it is true, does not contain the lemma *καὶ δῶμ' ἀπάκτου*, but it has the Scholium *κατὰ τῶν σκηνῶν ἄπαγε*.
1309. The Roman edition took no notice of *συνεμπόρους* being given as a various reading for *συγκειμένους*.

PHILOCTETES.

25. Elmsley's edition gives *κοινὰ δ' ἐξ ἀμφοῖν εἶη* as the lemma; but the remainder of the Scholium would lead us to suspect that *εἶη* is a mistake for *ἦη*, which is given by Brunck.

33. Brunck says "Scholiastes *στιπτῇ* habet, ut v. 2. *ἄστιπτος*." But this is not correct. In v. 2, the MS. has *ἄστιπτος* in the lemma, but at v. 32, there is no lemma at all.
180. It is incorrectly stated in this edition, that *εὐγενῶν* is omitted by Brunck as a gloss upon *πρωτογόνων*.
351. Brunck observes that the words of the Scholiast are mutilated in this place; but he is mistaken; as he is in saying that *ζῶντα* is given as an explanation of *ἄθαρτον*. The fact is, that instead of the Scholium, which Brunck has printed, the MS. only contains the single word *ζῶντα*, meaning evidently to supply it after *εἰδόμην*.
425. Brunck misrepresents the Scholiast, when he quotes him as reading *μόνος*. There is no lemma in the MS., and the Scholiast decidedly gives the preference to *γόνος*.
493. Brunck says that the Scholiast reads *παλάι' ἄν*. He inferred this from the lemma in the Roman edition; but there is no such lemma in the MS.

We could have drawn out these remarks to a much greater length; but enough perhaps has been said to show, that no future editor of Sophocles can depend upon any edition of the Roman Scholia but the one now before us. We acknowledge, that a more close examination of the book has not increased our estimation of the old Scholiast: many of his interpretations are superfluous, and some of them childish; but at the same time the antiquity of the commentary gives to it a real value. The notes evidently were not the work of the person who wrote them in the Laurentian MS.: as we observed above, they were copied from some older document; and, consequently, whatever various readings they contain, are entitled to respect, as resting upon older authority than those of any existing MS. It is in a critical point of view, that the old Scholia are valuable; for as an explanation of the text, they are frequently deserving of contempt. We should add, however, that they supply a few historical fragments, as well as a few verses from the lost works of some Greek poets. A good and useful index of these fragments is added at the end of the present edition.

We must now notice the other work, the title of which is placed at the head of the present article. It is an edition of Sophocles, printed at Oxford, the execution of which does particular credit to the Clarendon Press. The first thing which attracted our attention upon opening the book, was a new type: and, if we are not mistaken, this is the first work printed at the Clarendon press, to which this new type has been applied. The character is rather larger than that which was before in use; and though it bears a considerable resemblance to the Porsonian type used at Cambridge, it has, to our eye, a more elegant and pleas-

ing form. When we look back to Wytttenbach's Plutarch, which issued from the same press not more than twenty-six years ago, and in which such extraordinary pains were taken to disfigure the page with ligatures and contractions, we rejoice in thinking that both our universities have at length entirely cast off these perplexing deformities. The art of printing is surely an improvement upon the art of writing: and to imitate in printing the contrivances which were adopted by men who wrote for their bread, and who studied abbreviations that they might save trouble and gain time, is a kind of retrograde process in literature; and upon the same principle we might take to print without points, and with no separations between the words, because the ancients followed this plan in their MSS. Every thing which expedites the passing of the eye from the beginning of a line to the end, must be pronounced a gain; and the more rapidly we can understand the words of a sentence without pausing to think of their construction, the more pleasure we shall find in reading. Upon this principle we should perhaps be at issue with those scholars who have almost succeeded in banishing accents and marks of every kind from Latin books. It is unscholar-like, we are told, to point out the ablative case by a peculiar mark: and it is insulting to suppose, that readers cannot distinguish the adverb *probe* from the vocative *probe*. But the fact is, that in this, which may be called the mechanical part of reading, the persons to be consulted are not the brilliant, but the stupid portion of mankind: and let a person be ever so learned, it must frequently happen that he is obliged to carry on his eye to the end of a sentence, before he can tell to what parts of speech the words at the beginning of it are to be assigned. This suspense might, in many cases, be avoided, if the printer was permitted to remedy the equivocations of the Latin language. But we must return to Sophocles.

The edition before us comprises more in two volumes than any other which has preceded it. The notes of Brunck are inserted almost entire, together with many from Schæfer, Erfurdt, and other modern critics. The passages from Suidas and Eustathius, which refer to Sophocles, are also added; and from the use which has been made of the best MSS. in preparing these quotations, we think we can trace the valuable hand of Professor Gaisford in lending some assistance to this edition. The work is certainly not unworthy of being prepared under his auspices; and we are happy in again finding the labours of his lamented friend, Dr. Elmsley, applied to the illustration of his favourite tragedian. The MSS. which were collated by that accurate scholar at Florence, Rome, and Naples, (the collations of which are now the property of the Clarendon Press,) have been made use of in the

present edition; and when, beside these various *subsidia*, we see the beauty and (as far as we have observed) the accuracy of the typography, we hail with particular pleasure the appearance of what may truly be called the first Variorum edition of a Greek tragedian.

Our readers, who are admirers of Sophocles, will perhaps not be displeased if, after having taken some pains in ascertaining the different editions and best MSS. of Sophocles, we lay before them, in as few words as we can, the result of our inquiries.

Whether the MSS. which were used by the earliest editors of Greek classics are still preserved, is a problem, which will perhaps never be satisfactorily solved. Of many of the works which were printed by Aldus, nothing certain is known concerning the copies from which they were taken. Hence the Aldine classics have a real value far beyond that which the anti-bibliomaniasts suppose them to possess. If the MSS. from which they were printed are now lost, the printed edition stands in the place of a MS. of the fifteenth or sixteenth century; and when we consider the quarters from which MSS. were brought in the time of Aldus, there is every reason to think that many of them must have been much more ancient. It was this which caused Dr. Elmsley, in most of his editions of Greek plays, to print a separate collation of the Aldine readings. Scholars are not agreed as to the MSS. which Aldus used in his edition of Sophocles. It has been observed that his edition of Euripides bears a considerable resemblance to the Vatican MS.; and since the same document also contains four plays of Sophocles, he would naturally consult it in editing both tragedians. But there is also reason for conjecturing that he used the best of the Florence MSS., or one from which that MS. was copied; since he speaks of intending shortly to publish some Scholia which had been lately discovered; and there can be little doubt that these were the same Scholia which we have described above. Whoever will take the trouble to compare the Aldine readings with those which Dr. Elmsley has given from the collation of the Laurentian MS., (Laur. A.), will find that, upon the whole, they have a striking affinity to each other.

Without attempting however to ascertain the libraries which were visited by the first editors of Sophocles, we will proceed to give an account of the best and most ancient MSS. of that author, which have hitherto been consulted; and we shall arrange them according to the countries in which they are to be found, beginning with Italy.

FLORENCE.

We give the first place to this city, because it contains the

oldest and most valuable of all the MSS. of Sophocles. Whoever wishes to acquaint himself with the stores of the Laurentian library, must consult the ponderous catalogue of Bandini; but Dr. Elmsley, in his edition of the *Œdipus Coloneus*, tells us nearly all that we want to know of it with reference to Sophocles. The Laurentian library contains two MSS. of Sophocles, mentioned by Elmsley, which he calls Laur. A. and Laur. B. The first of these is the oldest and best of any which is known to exist; and it is that which has been mentioned above as containing the Roman Scholia. Apollonius Rhodius, and the seven plays of *Æschylus*, are also in it. Bandini assigns it to the tenth century.

Laur. B. is very inferior to the former. Elmsley pronounces it to be full of faults, and frequently interpolated by the person who transcribed it. It was apparently written in the fourteenth century.

Bandini mentions several other MSS. of Sophocles in the Laurentian library; but none of them are older than the fourteenth century, and all of them probably belong to the same *family* with Laur. B. We need not therefore mention them in detail.

Dr. Elmsley also collated two MSS. of this tragedian in the Riccardi library at Florence. The first of them is the best, but is of no great value. It resembles a MS. in the King's Library at Paris, which Brunck called Par. A; but it is more modern, and not so correct. In the *Œdipus Coloneus* it has been observed to contain some of the peculiar Aldine readings; but the play is imperfect. Herman obtained some collations from it for the Chorusses of Sophocles. The second Riccardi MS. is extremely inaccurate.

ROME.

The Vatican MS. contains four plays of Sophocles, (the *Œdipus Coloneus*, *Antigone*, *Trachiniæ*, and *Philoctetes*,) thirteen of Euripides, (including the *Rhesus*,) and three of *Æschylus*. It agrees with the second of Brunck's Paris MSS., but is not so good. D'Orville had it collated for the *Œdipus Coloneus* and *Trachiniæ*, and his collation was published in the edition of Sophocles printed at Oxford in 1812; but Elmsley obtained a much better collation of it, which was made by Amati. The person who consulted it for D'Orville assigned it to the eleventh century; but Elmsley diminished its value very much by bringing it down as low as the fourteenth.

Dr. Elmsley also collated another Vatican MS., containing part of the *Ajax*, the *Antigone*, *Electra*, and *Œdipus Tyrannus*; but he inspected it very hastily, on account of the numerous errors and inaccuracies which it contains.

Herman, in his reprint of Erfurdt's *Œdipus Tyrannus*, mentions a Codex Chigianus, which probably exists in the library of the Chigi family, in Rome.

In No. XIV. of the *Classical Journal*, p. 428, there is a collection of various readings of two MSS., taken from the margin of an Aldine Sophocles. They appear to have been collected at Rome by John Livineius, an eminent critic of the sixteenth century, who assisted Canter in collating Greek MSS. at Rome, for the Antwerp Polyglott. Since Canter himself published an edition of Sophocles in 1579, it might be expected that he made some use of these collations. If we compare them with the readings quoted by Elmsley from the Vatican MSS., it seems most probable that Livineius himself took them from the Vatican.

NAPLES.

Elmsley mentions one MS. at Naples, which formerly belonged to the Farnese library at Rome : but it is not a good one; it resembles that which Brunck called Par. T. but is not so correct.

PARIS.

The King's Library at Paris is rich in MSS. of Sophocles. Brunck collected various readings from six, which had been collated before, but not accurately, by Musgrave. Elmsley informs us that Brunck's collation was also imperfect. The names by which they are generally known, are Par. A. B. C. D. E. and T. Of these Par. A. is considered the best: it contains the seven plays, and is probably of the thirteenth century. Par. B. is spoken of by Elmsley as a good MS., but it only contains four plays, the *Œdipus Tyrannus*, *Trachiniæ*, *Philoctetes*, and *Œdipus Coloneus*: it is not so old as Par. A, but has been supposed to contain readings of some grammarian who lived earlier than the thirteenth century. C. D. and E. are all of them more modern, and contain only three plays, the *Œdipus Tyrannus*, *Electra*, and *Ajax*. Par. T. contains all the seven plays; and, in the opinion of Elmsley, it is the MS. which Turnebus consulted, and from which the Triclinian recension has been so generally adopted by later editors. Brunck however considered Turnebus to have used, not this MS., but some other which was not so good. The fact probably was, that Turnebus made use of Par. T, but neglected some of its readings. However this may be, the value of the MS. is considerable, and it contains some readings peculiar to itself.

Of these Paris MSS. Elmsley collated A. B. and T, together with another which he calls F, and which Brunck did not see. Elmsley does not speak favourably of it; and it appears to be an indifferent copy of Laur. A. All these MSS., including F, were

also collated by Faehsius, and the readings were published by him in *Sylloge Lectionum Græcarum*.

Bekker also collated two MSS. at Paris, which we must suppose to be different from any of the former. Herman made use of the collations in his reprints of Erfurdt's plays; and for some reason, which he does not assign, he designated them by the name of Venet. The readings appear to agree with those of the Vatican MS., but the collation was not accurately made.

ENGLAND.

Elmsley, in his preface to the *Œdipus Tyrannus*, speaks of having consulted four MSS. of Sophocles in England, and gives it as his opinion that no more are to be found. He alluded to three in the Bodleian library at Oxford, and one in that of Trinity College, Cambridge. But there is a fourth in the Bodleian library, of which he takes no notice. Three of them contain only two plays, the *Ajax* and *Electra*: the fourth (which is marked *Laud.*) contains these two and also the *Œdipus Tyrannus*. All these four MSS. were collated for Johnson's edition of Sophocles, which appeared in 1705; and some *Scholias*, which are contained in them, were also printed at the same time. Burton either collated them afresh, or made use of Johnson's collation, for his *Pentalogia*; but Elmsley condemns the carelessness with which the readings are given. Erfurdt and Herman both made use of Burton's collation; but the MSS. were probably never so carefully inspected as by Elmsley.

The Cambridge MS. is said to resemble Laur. A.

There are also three MSS. in the British Museum (see *Class. Journal*, No. xxi. p. 91.) of which collations are given in Porson's *Adversaria*, p. 177, &c.

GERMANY.

The more recent editors of Sophocles have consulted several MSS. which exist in public libraries in Germany, of which no use had hitherto been made. None of them however appear to be older than the fourteenth century.

Leipsic contains two MSS. which resemble each other, and which are not on the Triclinian recension. Some account is given of them by Herman in his preface to the *Ajax*; and the various readings are added in the republication of Elmsley's *Œdipus Tyrannus*, which was printed at Leipsic. One of them contains only the *Ajax*, *Electra*, and *Œdipus Tyrannus*; and this is probably the case with the other.

Dresden also furnishes two MSS., which are stated to have been brought from Mount Athos. They both are upon the Triclinian recension, and contain the *Ajax*, *Electra*, *Œdipus*

Tyrannus, and Antigone. One of them is of the fourteenth century; the other of the fifteenth. They were consulted by Erfurdt.

Augsburgh contains two MSS. One of them, which has the Ajax, Antigone, Œdipus Tyrannus, and Electra, was collated by Schweighæuser for Brunck's edition. Erfurdt pronounces this collation to have been carelessly made; and he obtained a better for his own edition from Herman. The other MS. was also collated for Erfurdt's edition, and is stated to resemble that in the library of Trinity College: consequently it must be classed with Laur. A.

Jena contains one MS. of the Ajax and Electra. Erfurdt made use of it, and considered it of the fourteenth century. It is certainly not upon the Triclinian recension, but furnishes an additional proof that all the readings, which Brunck attributed to Triclinius, were not peculiar to him. An account of this MS. was published by Heusinger in 1745, and by Purgoldus in 1802.

MOSCOW.

Matthæi collated two MSS. at Moscow with Johnson's edition; and the collations are preserved in the library at Dresden. Erfurdt and Herman made use of them. One of them contains the Ajax, Electra, and Œdipus Tyrannus, and is of the fourteenth century; the other has only the two former plays, and is of the fifteenth century.

From the sketch thus briefly and (we are afraid) imperfectly given of the MSS. of Sophocles, it will be seen, that very few contain all the seven plays. We have not been able in each case to ascertain their exact contents. Florence and Paris certainly possess MSS. in which all the plays are written; and in this respect we conceive that these libraries stand alone. Our readers will perhaps have observed, that the Œdipus Tyrannus, Ajax, and Electra, were by far the most popular tragedies; at least in the enumeration given above, the two latter occur in fourteen MSS., and the Œdipus Tyrannus in ten; independent of those which contain all the plays. It is somewhat singular, that the arrangement of the plays in the early editions (we believe in all of them previous to that of Johnson) exactly followed the estimation in which they appear respectively to have been held by the readers of MSS. We find them arranged by Aldus and his successors in the following order: Ajax, Electra, Œdipus Tyrannus, Antigone, Trachiniæ, and Philoctetes; and this is precisely the precedence which would be given them, if we were guided by the number of MSS. in which each of them occur.

Elmsley speaks of Laur. A. and Par. A. B. T. as having been of great assistance to him. They are certainly the best of all the

MSS. of Sophocles; and with the exception of a few innovations, which perhaps every scribe introduced in a greater or less degree, nearly all the readings of other MSS. are to be found in some one of these four. The simplest division, which the MSS. of Sophocles admit of, is into those which follow the recension of Triclinius, and those which have nothing to do with it. We shall say more of this recension, when treating of the editions of Sophocles; and it is sufficient to state at present, that though what may be called the Triclinian MSS. are by far the most numerous, the others are the most valuable. Par. T. is to be placed at the head of those which follow Triclinius; but Laur. A., which leads the other division, is unquestionably the best.

When we proceed to class the editions of Sophocles, we must also make two of our divisions relate to the Triclinian recension. The editions of Sophocles should, in fact, be divided into three classes. The first would comprehend all that were printed between the times of Aldus and Turnebus, i.e. from 1502 to 1552: the second class would extend from 1552 to Brunck's edition in 1786; which would include what might be called the Triclinian age of Sophocles: and the third class would extend from Brunck's time to our own. It might perhaps not be incorrect to subdivide the second of these classes, and make Johnson's edition, which appeared in 1705, the commencement of a separate division. This edition made a new arrangement of the plays, and introduced some unpublished Scholia together with the readings of the Oxford MSS., and it has been republished several times in different places. But Johnson scarcely did enough for his author to have his book placed at the head of a new division; and Brunck may fairly be said to have produced a greater revolution among the editors of Sophocles, than any person since the time of Turnebus. The Brunckian age of Sophocles must perhaps be said in its turn to have come to an end, and the age of anarchy to have begun. Herman is himself looked upon as a demi-god by the Germans, and neither Erfurdt nor Bothe have thought it necessary to adhere to the plan of any former editor. Elmsley has thrown such light upon Sophocles by the aid of his Italian collations, that the labours of Brunck are thrown considerably into the shade: and though the edition now before us professes to be constructed upon the basis of that of Brunck, yet the additional matter is fully equal to the former in value; and no future editor can ever think of reprinting Brunck's edition without incorporating some of the labours of later critics.

The editio princeps of Sophocles was printed at Venice in 1502, by Aldus, and was the first of the three Greek tragedians which issued from that celebrated press. It forms a small octavo

volume of 192 leaves, and the title page announces, that it was to be accompanied with some commentaries. These however never appeared. Aldus probably alluded to the Scholia which had been lately discovered, and which, in the dedication to John Lascar, he speaks of intending shortly to publish. He also mentions some materials for the better arrangement of the chorusses, which he hoped to print with the Scholia, and the absence of which had made his edition not so perfect in that respect as he could have wished. Lascar was at this time in Venice, as ambassador from Louis XII. to the Republic. We have already mentioned, that this formed the basis of all the editions till the time of Turnebus, and that the plays were arranged in the following order, Ajax, Electra, Œdipus Tyrannus, Antigone, Œdipus Coloneus, Trachiniæ, and Philoctetes.

1522. This edition is known by the name of the first Junta, having been printed at the press which then belonged to the heirs of Filippo Giunti, at Florence. The editor was Antonio Francini: and in the second Junta, which appeared in 1547, it is said, that great pains were taken in this first edition to remove even the smallest faults. The three first plays were stated to have received particular attention, and the readings of some old and valuable MSS. were collated. Since the publication of the Aldine edition, the Scholia had been published at Rome; and this was the first edition in which they appeared together with the text: but they were considerably interpolated with Scholia from other MSS.

1528. This edition was printed at Paris, in 8vo., by Simon Colinaeus, without the Scholia. It is formed upon the Aldine edition, from which, according to Elmsley, it scarcely ever varies, except in the correction of typographical errors. Some copies have at the end three leaves which contain various readings taken from an old MS.

1534. This edition may be considered the first which contained any notes of the editor. It was printed at Haguenau (Haganoæ) in octavo, under the direction of Joachim Camerarius. The family name of this celebrated scholar was Leibhard; but some of their ancestors having held the office of chamberlain at the Imperial court, they changed it to Cammermeister, which was Latinized into Camerarius. He was a Protestant, and attended the diet at Augsburg in 1530. In this edition the notes of Camerarius only extended to the Œdipus Tyrannus, Coloneus, and Antigone; but in 1556, he published at Basle a commentary upon all the tragedies of Sophocles. The Scholia accompanied the edition of 1534.

1543. If the account which we have seen is correct, the first

Latin translation of Sophocles was printed in this year at Venice, having been made by J. B. Gabia, of Verona: but never having seen the volume, we shall reserve what we have to say of the early Latin translations, till we come to the year 1548.

1544. This edition was printed at Frankfort, in large octavo, by Peter Brubachius, and contains the Scholia. It is said to follow the first Junta edition; and whoever examines it, will find a singular instance of disarrangement of numbers between pages 129 and 137, though the matter contained in the pages is all right. This edition was reprinted at Frankfort in 1550, 1555, and 1567.

1547. Florence. Junta: large 8vo. This is the second Junta edition, which has been much more referred to by scholars than the first. The printer was Bernardo Giunti, and the editor, P. Victorius. The preface speaks of excellent and ancient MSS. having been used, which enabled them to remove several errors and corruptions, particularly in the *Œdipus Tyrannus*, *Coloneus*, and *Trachiniæ*, as well as to add some Scholia. Dr. Elmsley however informs us, that an examination of the book by no means confirms these professions of improvement. The Aldine text was evidently the basis, from which this differs in about fifty places; but the typographical errors are so many, that sometimes it is difficult to distinguish them from intentional various readings. It is the opinion of Elmsley, that the editor made use of the Laurentian MS., which we have called A., and no other; but that he sometimes corrected the text from the Roman Scholia; and in other places his alterations agree with no known MS. whatever. The Roman Scholia are printed in the same page with the text.

1548. We have mentioned under the date 1543, that J. B. Gabia, of Verona, published a Latin translation of Sophocles in that year; but we have not been so fortunate as to see the volume. The translation cannot have excited much notice; for we afterwards find two other persons, G. Ratallerus, of Louvain, and Joannes Lalamantius, each of them putting forth what they called the first Latin translation of Sophocles. We have not seen the volume which Ratallerus printed in 1548; but from a second edition, which he published in 1576, we learn, that in 1548 a translation of three tragedies of Sophocles had been printed by him at Leyden; and in the second edition, which contained all the seven plays, he mentions the year in which some of the translations were composed: thus the *Ajax* was translated in 1548, the *Antigone* in 1549, the *Œdipus Coloneus* in 1552, the *Trachiniæ* and *Philoctetes* in 1553. The reason is plain, why the dates are given with this precision. In 1557, J. Lalamantius, a

physician of Autun, published at Paris, what he termed the *first* Latin translation of Sophocles: and in the preface to the second edition of Ratallerus's translation it is asserted, that Lalamantius borrowed very largely from Ratallerus, even so much as to copy whole pages. Ratallerus therefore affixed the dates to his own translations, that his claim to being the first translator might thus be demonstrated. The question, in fact, can admit of no dispute. Ratallerus certainly printed his first edition at Leyden before Lalamantius published his translation at Paris; and it is equally certain, that Lalamantius borrowed from Ratallerus, though he does occasionally mention his name. We have dwelt longer than we intended upon this point, because it is interesting to ascertain who were the earliest translators of Sophocles into Latin; and the order of priority seems to have been as follows:—

1543. J. B. Gabia, Venice.

1548. G. Ratallerus, Leyden, three plays.

1557. J. Lalamantius, Paris.

1576. G. Ratallerus, second edition.

1584. ———— third edition.

1550. This was a reprint, in small octavo, of the Frankfort edition, without the Scholia. See above at 1544.

1553. Paris. Turnebi. 4to. This is the edition which began a new æra in the history of Sophocles. Up to this time all former editors had followed Aldus, with only a few deviations from his text: but henceforth the edition of Turnebus was held in such high estimation, that Stephens and Canter and other great scholars thought it unlawful to depart from it. Brunck has abused Turnebus as being unfit for the office which he undertook; and certainly the changes which he introduced must be considered, on the whole, to have been very unfortunate; but Brunck was rather too severe in his censure. The history of Turnebus and his editorial labours is briefly this. He was a native of France, though Scotland puts in a claim to him, and asserts that his family name *Tournebauf* was nothing more than *Turnbull*, and that he was the son of a Scotch gentleman, who settled in Normandy. Be this as it may, he was considered to be a most profound Greek scholar in his day, and combined the two offices, which have not often been united in the same person, of king's printer and king's professor of Greek. Among other learned works he brought out an edition of Sophocles in 1553. In the copy which we have seen, the date at the end is 1552, but in the title page 1553, which probably led Harwood into the error of naming two different editions. We believe, that in some copies the date in the title page is also 1552. He informs us himself, that he had possession of a MS. given him by Cæmarus

Ranconetus, which contained the tragedies of Sophocles, arranged, corrected, and commented upon by Triclinius. Of this Triclinius little is known. He was a monk of the 14th century, and wrote Scholia upon the text and the metres of Sophocles. If he did not introduce many arbitrary alterations of his own (for which he seems hardly to have been competent) the copies which he used must have differed very materially from those which were consulted by Aldus and his successors: hence the Triclinian recension has been adopted as the name of a certain class or family of MSS. The order of the plays is however the same. It was the fashion formerly to accuse Triclinius of having altered the text of Sophocles without any authority: but it has been proved by Elmsley and other critics, that many of his peculiar readings are contained in MSS. which are older than the time of Triclinius. Laur. A., for instance, agrees with some of them. Elmsley was of opinion, that the MS. which Turnebus used was that which Brunck called T. in the king's library at Paris: he also introduced some readings which are peculiar to Par. B. The Scholia upon Sophocles were also considerably augmented from the Triclinian MS., for it contained some which were totally different from the Roman; and henceforward the distinction was adopted of old and new Scholia. Turnebus printed both; and he is charged by Stephens with having sent them out full of errors: he observes also that the Scholia, which Turnebus published upon the three last plays under the name of Triclinius, had been edited before. In this edition some various readings are noted in the margin.

1555. The Frankfort edition was printed a third time in this year. See above at 1544 and 1550.

1558. Fabricius mentions an edition printed by Turnebus in this year at Paris without the Scholia. We have not seen a copy of it.

1558. In this same year another Latin translation was published at Basle, which is the last that we shall notice. The author was Thomas Naogeorgius. The book also contained annotations; and we mention it, because it was much sought for in its day on account of these notes. Naogeorgius was a satirical writer against the court of Rome, and published *Regnum Papticum*, and other similar works.

1567. A fourth edition was printed this year at Frankfort: and since the editor of this, of which we have seen a copy, was the same who had edited the first, viz. Peter Brubachius, we may suppose that he also superintended the second and third editions. See above at 1544, 1550, 1555.

1568. Paris. H. Stephani. 4to. In the preceding year Stephens

had printed a small volume called *Tragœdiæ selectæ Æschyli, Sophoclis et Euripidis*, which contained of Sophocles the Ajax, Electra, and Antigone in Greek, and also translations of them by Ratallerus. In the present year he printed an edition of all the plays of Sophocles. It was formed on the basis of Turnebus, and contains the new and old Scholia, which Stephens professes to have printed much more accurately. It is plain that he was extremely pleased with this edition: for he had already edited Æschylus in such a manner, that he considered little more remained to be done, and yet the following distich appears in the title-page of his Sophocles:

“ Æschylon edideram, Sophocles invidit, at idem,
Cur ab eo posthac invideatur, habet.”

The title-page also announced that his annotations upon Sophocles and Euripides would be published in that same year. We have already mentioned that the commentary of Camerarius upon all the seven plays had been printed at Basle in 1556. This commentary was added by Stephens to his own edition. The great fame of Stephens has gained him more credit for the benefit conferred by him upon Sophocles than he appears to deserve. Elmsley considered the text to be not so good as that which Turnebus printed: he conceived also that Stephens had consulted but few former editions, and no new MSS.; and the annotations, which were published separately in that same year, do not contain much which is of any value.

1578. Fabricius mentions an edition of Sophocles published this year at Wittenberg by Mat. Welaccus.

1579. Antverpiæ. Canteri. 8vo. This volume forms one of a set of the Tragedians, printed at the press of Christopher Plantin; but it is a small and ugly book. William Canter, the editor, was a native of Utrecht, and died at the early age of thirty-three. He altered the text of Stephens in a few places, and professed to have done a great deal towards arranging the chorusses in a better and clearer manner. We cannot however see that he did much beyond placing the words *ιαυβοὶ, ἀνάπαιστοι, ἀντιστροφικά*, &c. in their respective places. He also added some notes, which he took principally from Stephens; but they do not occupy more than seven pages in all.

1585. Fabricius mentions another edition printed in this year at Wittenberg. See above at 1578.

1593. It is always said that Canter's edition was reprinted in this year at Leyden. We have compared the two copies, and certainly there are some marks which would seem to point out two separate editions. But the contents of each page exactly

agree in both; and at the end of what is called the second edition, there is the same notice which was printed in the first, "*Antverpiæ excudebat Christophorus Plantinus Architypographus Regius Anno MDLXXX.*"

1597. This is also a republication of Canter's edition made at Heidelburgh, and printed by Commelin. It is called Canter's edition, because it contained his notes, and the chorusses were arranged upon his plan: but there was also added a literal Latin translation, made by Vitus Winsemius, which is printed on the opposite page to the Greek; and this is the first edition which contained a version of the text arranged in this way.

We have thus seen that the sixteenth century furnished seventeen editions of Sophocles, beside the Latin translations, which were published separately; and there may perhaps be others which we have omitted. The following century was not nearly so prolific, for in the whole course of it we have not heard of more than four different editions.

1603. Paul Stephens printed an edition in 4to. this year, and Geneva is generally mentioned as the place of publication. The copy which we have seen has no mention of any place, and this probably has led some persons to say that it was printed at Paris. The text is taken from H. Stephens's edition of 1568; but each page contains, below the text, the Latin translation made by Winsemius. The new and old Scholia are also printed at the top and bottom of the page. At the end are the metrical Scholia of Triclinius, the annotations of H. Stephens, and the commentary of Camerarius: so that this volume, though not much noticed by later critics, comprised nearly everything that had hitherto been done for the illustration of Sophocles.

1608. We find notice of an edition in 8vo., printed at Ingolstadt with the Scholia, but we have not seen a copy of it.

1614. It may be mentioned also that the plays of Sophocles will be found in the first volume of a *Corpus Poetarum Græcorum*, printed in folio at Geneva in this year.

1665. Cantabrigiæ, 8vo. We are not able to give any detailed account of an edition said to be printed at Cambridge in this year, with a Latin version, and all the Scholia. Some copies are stated to have the date of 1673.

1705-8. The eighteenth century was ushered in with a new edition of Sophocles, which long bore a considerable character, and has been often reprinted. We mean that of Johnson. The first volume was published at Oxford in 1705, and the second in 1708: the third, which was printed in London, did not appear till 1746, making in all a complete edition in three volumes 8vo. Our readers will have observed, that through the course of the seven-

teenth century little or nothing was done toward throwing new light upon the tragedies of Sophocles. Turnebus was in fact the last editor, of whom we can say with certainty, that he made use of any new MSS. The praise therefore which was bestowed upon Johnson's edition, was not given without reason. Thomas Johnson does not appear to have been a man of any remarkable attainments; but he was diligent and accurate; and if his own country had furnished more materials, he would probably have availed himself of them. He was a native of Oxfordshire, and educated at Cambridge. The only MSS. which he consulted, were the four which are now in the Bodleian: but three of these only contain the Ajax and Electra, and the fourth, in addition to those two plays, has the *Œdipus Tyrannus*. Accordingly we find no various readings in Johnson's edition, except in these three plays. He added however some unpublished Scholia from the Oxford MSS.: he reprinted the Roman, or old Scholia, as well as those of Triclinius; he composed a new Latin translation, and added some notes. These notes are but few: in the first and second volumes they appear to have been Johnson's own; but in the third they are mostly selected from other editors. The first volume contains the Ajax and Electra; the second has the Antigone and Trachiniæ; the third has the *Œdipus Tyrannus*, Philoctetes and *Œdipus Coloneus*.

1722. In this year a small edition was published in two volumes 12mo. containing the Scholia. The editor was Michael Maittaire, who was well known at that period for several classical works. It has been said that the preface was written by Tonson: but Tonson disowned it.

1745. Johnson's edition was reprinted at Glasgow by Foulis, in one volume 4to. and two volumes 8vo. The latter edition is said to be extremely inaccurate.

1746-7. Elmsley, in his preface to the *Œd. Tyrannus*, speaks of an anonymous edition of Sophocles published in London in 1746, and in his preface to the *Œd. Coloneus* he mentions another, likewise anonymous, published in 1747. We conceive that he meant the same edition, which consisted of two duodecimo volumes, in which not only the text of Stephens, but nearly all his typographical errors were faithfully copied.

1758. Johnson's edition was reprinted in London by Bowyer, in two volumes 8vo. Bowyer however only superintended the Ajax, Electra, Trachiniæ, and Antigone; and in preparing the two first of these plays he had the assistance of Palairêt. Vauvilliers states, in the preface to his own edition of 1781, that Johnson's was reprinted in London exactly in the same form, and so precisely similar, that even the typographical errors were the

same, and every little defect or failure of the press might be traced in both, and yet that they were certainly two different editions. We imagine Vauvilliers to have alluded to this reprint of 1758; but not having seen a copy of it, we have not been able to compare it with the original edition of 1705.

1774. This also is a reprint of Johnson's edition, in two volumes 8vo., published at Eton. The editor was J. Tweedie.

1781. Paris, Capperonneri, two volumes 4to. The first preparations for this edition were made by John Capperonnier, professor of Greek, and librarian to the king of France; but upon his death in 1777 the work was carried on by John Francis Vauvilliers, who succeeded him as professor. He printed all the Scholia, including those of Johnson, which he corrected in several places; and made some alterations in the Latin translation, and added some notes as well as an index. In a critical point of view, Vauvilliers did little or nothing for the text, having been prevented from consulting the MSS. in the king's library, which Brunck had just obtained permission to carry to Strasburg. Brunck published a volume in 1779, containing the *Œdipus Tyrannus* and *Electra* of Sophocles, and the *Andromache* of Euripides. Vauvilliers had the opportunity of seeing this volume before his own edition of Sophocles came out; and he states in his preface, that Brunck had anticipated him in many conjectures. The notes are not numerous, and, on the whole, the edition is more remarkable for the beauty of its appearance than any real addition which it makes to the elucidation of Sophocles.

1786. Argentorati. Brunckii. 4to and 8vo. 2 vols. We are now arrived at what we fixed as the third era in the history of the editions of Sophocles. The Triclinian recension had been followed by every editor since the year 1552; and with the exception of Johnson, in 1705, no person had consulted any new MSS. Richard Francis Philip Brunck, who was born at Strasburg in 1729, and who applied himself to Greek literature as an amusement, undertook an edition of Sophocles upon an entirely new plan. He saw the defects which Turnebus had been the means of introducing into the text; and in the censures which he passes upon Triclinius he perhaps goes a little too far; but we must always be greatly indebted to him for recurring once more to the Aldine readings, which had been so long neglected. He tells us that he made the Aldine edition the basis of his own, and that he never departed from it without acquainting his reader with the fact. His principal merit however, and that which justly entitles him to stand at the head of a new school, is the collation of MSS. In order to ascertain the true readings of the text, he consulted eight MSS., of which we have already given some account; six were in the King's library at Paris, one came from Augsburg, and

one belonged to himself. By the help of these MSS., and sometimes by his own conjectures, he reduced the text to a much greater state of purity than it had hitherto assumed. He added a Latin translation, which is inconvenient to refer to, from not having the verses marked by the side. His notes are more critical than explanatory; and he speaks of having received some observations of Tyrwhitt and Hubert Van Eldik. The arrangement of the plays was altered by him; and he was the first editor who took the trouble of making a verbal index of *Sophocles*. This index, though by no means perfect, and in some respects inconvenient, is a great advantage to every reader. The edition was followed, in 1789, by a third volume, containing the *Scholia*. Brunck was well aware of the numerous interpolations which the *Scholia* had received; and we have already mentioned that he thought to restore them to their purity by following the Roman edition of 1518. With this view he printed the Roman *Scholia* by themselves; which were followed by other *Scholia*, taken from former editions or from MSS.; and lastly, he printed the *Scholia* of Triclinius, omitting those which concern the metres, as being trifling and useless. This third volume also contains the fragments of *Sophocles*, which no former editor had collected; and a lexicon of those *Sophoclean* words which are quoted by the old grammarians. Our readers will have perceived by this hasty sketch, that the benefits rendered to *Sophocles* by Brunck were important, and the original matter which his edition contains is considerable. He was perhaps not a profound scholar, and his collation of MSS. may not have been made with great care; but the example which he so spiritedly set has been ably followed; and experience has shown, that the critical apparatus which he collected for *Sophocles* has materially abridged the labours of all subsequent editors.

1786. The same year which saw Brunck's edition issue from the press, also called forth another, which was printed at Eton in quarto. The superior merit of Brunck's edition has thrown this into the shade; but as a critical work it was well deserving of notice. The Greek text was said to be corrected by Harwood; at the end of which are some short notes, and then a most copious and excellent index by Morell; various readings are also added, from the editions of Aldus and Turnebus; so that, in the same year, two editions, in two very distant places, agreed in the propriety of recurring once more to the Aldine edition.

1789. In this year Brunck again printed his edition, in three volumes octavo; but the impression did not extend beyond 250 copies. Some new notes were added, the text was occasionally altered, more liberties were taken in correcting the Roman *Scholia*, and those of Triclinius were omitted.

1800. Oxonii. 2 vols. 8vo. This edition was prepared from the papers which Musgrave left behind him at his death. Dr. Samuel Musgrave was a physician at Exeter, and after having taken part in political disputes in 1761, distinguished himself by an edition of Euripides and other classical works. He had made considerable preparations for publishing Sophocles, and some time before his death he caused a sheet to be printed, which contained the text according to Johnson's edition, and his own notes below. He died in 1782; and in 1800 the Delegates of the Clarendon Press caused his papers which were prepared for this edition to be published. It is evident that the work was not left by him in a finished state; but he had been at great pains in collating former editions, and his notes, though containing many very improbable conjectures, are useful to the student, and display considerable acquaintance with the classics. It does not appear that he had consulted any new MSS. There was found among his papers an index of the passages of Sophocles which are quoted by Suidas; and this is printed in the second volume. The persons who superintended the edition have also thrown in some very useful additions. Between the text and the notes the various readings are marked of the Aldine edition, both the Florentine, and those of Colinæus, Turnebus, and Brunck; in which respect this edition possesses an advantage over every one that preceded it. The fragments of the lost plays are added from Brunck's edition, and the index is also taken from the same; but upon comparing them, we observe that several words were introduced which Brunck had not noticed, so that the index in Musgrave's edition is better than that of Brunck. The Scholia were afterwards printed at Oxford, to match this edition.

1802-11. The editor who has taken the most pains with Sophocles, since the time of Brunck, is Erfurdt; but he died before the work which he had undertaken was completed. His intention was to publish each play separately, in quarto and octavo, so that each would occupy a volume. To make his edition more perfect, he consulted six MSS., of which only two had been collated before. Two of these MSS. came from Dresden, two from Augsburg, one from Jena, and one from Moscow. One of the Augsburg MSS. had been collated imperfectly by Brunck, and the various readings of the Jena MS. had been twice published; the rest were new. Erfurdt also received annotations from many German scholars, particularly Herman, whose talents and assistance he rated very highly. Under the text he printed various readings from Aldus, Brubachius, Turnebus, H. Stephens, Canter, and Brunck; but he states that he had not seen either of the Junta editions. He printed the old Scholia from the first edition of 1518, copying even the errors, to which he added all the other

Scholia which Brunck had printed. Erfurdt lived to publish six of the plays, which appeared in the following order:—1802, the *Trachiniæ*; 1803, *Electra*; 1805, *Philoctetes*; 1806, *Antigone*; 1809, *Œdipus Tyrannus*; 1811, *Ajax*. He gave notice of intending to publish a lexicon of Sophocles, and a very full verbal index. It is to be regretted that he did not live to complete this part of his plan, since he gave proofs of great industry in his collection of various readings, and of much learning as well as judgment in his notes, which are by far the most copious of any which have yet appeared upon Sophocles. In 1825 a seventh volume was published, containing the *Œdipus Coloneus*, which was edited, on the same plan, by Heller and Doederlein: and since Erfurdt's death, Herman has printed an abridgment of his edition, in seven volumes duodecimo, some of which have already gone to a second edition.

1806. Lipsiæ. Bothii. 2 vols. 8vo. This edition is not much known in England, nor is it desirable that it should, if Elmsley's account of Bothe be correct, that he surpassed all the editors of all the poets in the rashness and exuberance of his criticism, and scarcely left any passage of Sophocles unaltered. The edition contains a Latin version, all Brunck's notes as well as those of other scholars, a lexicon *Sophocleum*, and an index.

1808. Brunck's edition has been often reprinted in England. The present edition was printed at Oxford, by Bliss, in two volumes octavo.

1812. Another edition was printed at Oxford, by Parker and Bliss, in three volumes octavo, which was taken from the third edition published by Brunck in 1789.

1816. The *Classical Journal* for this year announces an edition of Sophocles, in two volumes quarto, to be published at Leipsic, by Beck. It contains a Latin version, the old Scholia and those of Triclinius, selections from the notes of Stephens, Johnson, Heath, Brunck, Musgrave, &c. and Beck himself. We have never seen this edition; but, from the known industry of Beck, it is likely to be an useful work, though not perhaps bearing marks of deep erudition or original genius.

1819. London. 3 vols. 8vo. Priestley. This is not merely a reprint of Brunck's edition; but besides every thing which that editor contributed, it contains a selection of the various readings from Erfurdt's edition, and some unpublished notes of Dr. C. Burney.

1820. Oxford. 3 vols. 8vo. Parker and Bliss. This is also a reprint of Brunck, with additions, some notes of Schæfer and Erfurdt being incorporated with the rest.

1822. Herman, in his own edition of the *Trachiniæ*, mentions

an edition of Sophocles which was published about this time, by Martin, at Hall. We have not seen the work.

In the same year, Whittaker published the plays, in a single volume, in London. The text and notes were taken from a comparison of both of Brunck's editions.

1824. Paris. Boissonade. 2 vols. 12mo. This is a pretty little edition, and forms the ninth volume of a series of Greek poets. A very few notes are added at the end.

1825. Lipsic. Dindorf. 12mo. This edition was printed at Lipsic, though some of the title-pages profess that it was published in London. The editor consulted three MSS. in the Laurentian library at Florence; but Elmsley had already extracted every thing that was valuable in that collection.

1826. We have mentioned above that Herman published an abridgment of Erfurdt's edition, in seven volumes duodecimo; the contents of these seven volumes have now been published in two volumes octavo in London; and like every thing else that comes from Herman, the notes are well worth the attention of scholars.

We have thus finished our review of the editions of Sophocles; and if we complained of the little which had been done for this author in the seventeenth century, and in the eighteenth till the time of Brunck, it appears that the critics and publishers of the nineteenth century are determined not to be remiss. There are probably many more editions, which we have omitted; and we have been obliged to take no notice of the publications of single plays; but the reader, who is interested in the works of Sophocles, will perhaps not be sorry to have this somewhat tedious summary of editorial labours. Elmsley, in his preface to the *Œdipus*, speaks of the six following editions as *nobilissimæ*; the Aldine, the second Junta, those of Turnebus, H. Stephens, Brunck's third edition, and that of Erfurdt. The great name of H. Stephens has perhaps alone caused him to be placed in this list; and if we were to make any addition to it, we should put in a word in favour of Johnson, who reigned almost alone in this country and on the continent for the former half of the last century, and of whom Elmsley scarcely makes any mention in his numerous publications.

We feel that little room remains for us to speak of the Oxford Variorum edition, which is now before us. We have said above, that it comprises more in two volumes than any other edition which has preceded it. If this remark were limited to the quantity of annotation, it would not be strictly true; for Erfurdt's notes are much more voluminous, as might be expected, when he made each play occupy a separate volume. Erfurdt also added the

Scholia: and this is not done in the Oxford edition, because the volume, which we have already noticed at the beginning of this article, forms the most accurate edition of the Roman Scholia, and may be considered as a companion to the other two. The fragments of the lost plays, the lexicon Sophocleum and the verbal index, which appeared for the first time in Brunck's edition, are added at the end of the second volume; but it would have been better if the index had been copied from Musgrave's edition, which, as we stated above, is more copious than that of Brunck.

Having said so much in the preceding pages of Dr. Elmsley's criticisms, we shall devote the remainder of this article to mentioning those passages of Sophocles which he proposed to correct. We have taken the observations from the notes to his different plays: some of them, we perceive, have been noticed in the edition before us; but many others have been omitted: we do not wish to defend them all, or to propose their being admitted into the text; but having been in the habit of transcribing them in the margin of our own copy, those of our readers, who are equal admirers of Dr. Elmsley, may perhaps be pleased to do the same. We refer to the verses of the Oxford edition, and in most cases shall quote Elmsley's own words.

ŒDIPUS TYRANNUS.

18. οἶδε τ' ἠθέων. 1. οἱ δ' ἔτ' ἠθέων. ad Bacch. 693. Elmsley took no notice of this correction in his own edition of the Œ. T.

ŒDIPUS COLONEUS.

79. οἶδε γὰρ κρινοῦσί γε. Suspectas habeo particulas γὰρ et γε hoc modo positas. Malim, οἶδε γὰρ κρινοῦσιν εὔ. Si sana est vulgata, ordo est, οἶδε γε γὰρ κρινοῦσι. ad Med. 480.
 408. οὐκ ἄρ' ἐμοῦ. legendum arbitior οὐ τᾶρα. ad Heracl. 269.
 421. ἀλλ' οἱ θεοὶ σφι μήτε τὴν πεπρωμένην. Mihi præstare videtur σφιν. ad Med. 393.
 641. τῇδε γὰρ ξυνοίσομαι. 1. ξυνοίσομεν.
 1266. τὰμὰ μὴ ἔξ ἄλλων πύθῃ. Brunckius ex ingenio dedit τοῦτο pro τὰλλα, rectius facturus si ταῦτα dedisset. ad Heracl. 669.
 1506. τύχην τις ἐσθλὴν τῇσδ' ἔθηκε τῆς ὁδοῦ. legendum fortasse τύχη τις ἐσθλὴ ἔθηκε τήνδε τὴν ὁδόν. ad Heracl. 934.
 1632. δὲς μοι (vel μου) χερὲς σῆς πίστιν ἀρχαίαν τέκνοις. ad Med. 21.

ANTIGONE.

76. σοὶ δ' εἰ δοκεῖ, Τὰ τῶν θεῶν ἐντιμ' ἀτιμάσας ἔχε. Hic non male legeretur σὺ δ', εἰ δοκεῖ, ad Med. 436.
 96. πείσομαι γὰρ οὐ Τοσοῦτον οὐδέν. Malim πείσομαι γὰρ οὖν. ad Med. 804.
 484. ἦ νῦν ἐγὼ μὲν οὐκ ἀνὴρ. scribendum videtur ἦ τᾶρ'. ad Heracl. 651.
 670. τοῦδε χρὴ κλύειν. Malim χρῆν. ad Heracl. 959.
 1158. καταρρέπει. Ad lemma in Schol. adscriptum Elmsl. κατατρέπει. v. Brunck ad l.

TRACHINIÆ.

237. Εὐβοῖς. 1. Εὐβωίς. ad Heracl. 84.
 307. ὦ δυστύλαινα, τίς ποτ' εἶ, νεανίδων; ita interpungendum videtur. ad Heracl. 567.
 401. Εὐβωίς ut supra.
 643. ἰάχων καταχᾶν ἐπάνεισιν. nemo non videt metro convenientius esse ἀχῶν. ad Heracl. 752.
 677. ἀργῆτ' οἶδς εὐείρου πόκφ. lego, ἀργῆτ' οἶδς εὐέρου πόκον. ad Heracl. 693. Addend.
 1228. λάβοι. malim λάβη. ad Œd. T. 903.

AJAX.

98. ὡς (vulgo ὦσθ') οὐποτ' Αἴανθ' οἶδ' ἀτιμάσουσ' ἔτι. ad Med. 596.
 108. πρὶν ἂν ξεθείς πρὸς κίον' ἐρκείου στέγης. κίον' accusativus est. ad Heracl. 693, Addend.
 1006. ποῖ γὰρ μολεῖν μοι δυνατόν, εἰς ποίους βρότους, Τοῖς σοῖς ἀρήξαντ' ἐν πόνοισι μηδαμοῦ; sive μοι, quod malim, sive με legas, ἀρήξαντ' accusativus est. ad Heracl. 693, Addend.
 1404. legendum τὸν θ' ὑψίβατον. ad Œd. T. 220.

PHILOCTETES.

106. οὐκ ἄρ' ἐκείνφ. legendum arbitror οὐ τᾶρ'. ad Heracl. 269.
 114. οὐκ ἄρ' ὁ πέρσων. idem.
 593. ἢ μὴν ἢ λόγῳ Πείσαντες ἄξειν. longe numerosius esset ἢ μὴν νιν λόγῳ. ad Med. 1271.
 933. τὸν βίον μὴ μου' φέλης. scribendum μ' ἀφέλης, vel plene μου ἀφέλης. ad Med. 56.
 1172. τί μ' ὦλεσας; τί μ' εἰργασαι; malim εἰργάσω propter ὦλεσας. ad Med. 1319.
 1381. ἂ σοί τε κάμοι κάλ' ὁρῶ τελούμενα. Rectius alii κάλ' ἂν ὁρῶ τελούμενα, id est, κάλα ἂν γεγόμενα ὁρῶ, εἰ τελοῖτο. ad Med. 1067.
 1440. τοῦτο δ' ἐννοεῖσθ'. rectius fortasse legeretur ἐννοεῖθ'. ad Med. 852.
 1448. κάγῳ γνώμη ταύτη τίθεμαι. legendum γνώμην ταύτην. ad Heracl. 1053.

ELECTRA.

409. τῷ τοῦτ' ἤρεσεν; non dubito Sophoclem τούτ' scripsisse.
 960. ἢ πάρεστι μὲν στένειν Πλούτου πατρῷου κτήσιν ἐστερημένην, Πάρεστι δ' ἀλγεῖν, ἐς τοσόνδε τοῦ χρόνου Ἀλεκτρα γηράσκουσιν ἀνυμέναιά τε. Quis vulgatæ scripturæ ita addictus est, ut non fateatur, poetam ante accusativum γηράσκουσιν potius ἐστερημένην quam ἐστερημένην fuisse scripturum? ad Med. 1207.
 1006. λῖνι γὰρ ἡμᾶς οὐδέν. Scribendum suspicor ἡμῖν. ad Med. 553.
 1208. μὴ, πρὸς γενείου, μ' ἐξέλη (vulgo μὴ' ἐξέλη) τὰ φίλτατα. ad Heracl. 977.
 1312. οὐποτ' ἐκλήξω χαρᾶς Δακρυβρόουσα. Schæferi emendationem χαρᾶ pro χαρᾶς damnat. ad Med. 445.
 1405. ἰὼ στέγαι Φίλων ἔρημοι, τῶν δ' ἀπολλύντων πλέα, ita scribo pro πλέαι, quod analogiæ repugnat: a masculino πλέφ derivatur femininum πλέα. ad Med. 259.

ART. II.—*The Life of John Sharpe, D. D. Lord Archbishop of York, to which are added, select Original, and Copies of Original Papers in Three Appendixes, collected from his Diary, Letters, and several other authentic Testimonies, by his Son, Thomas Sharpe, D.D. Archdeacon of Northumberland, Prebendary of York, Durham, and Southwell: Rector of Rethbury.* Edited by THOMAS NEWCOME, M.A. Rector of Shenly, Herts; and Vicar of Nottenham, Middlesex. London. Rivingtons. 1825. 2 vols. 8vo. 21s.

OF the character of the work before us we shall speak with as much brevity as the most laconic of our readers can desire. We shall merely assure them, that it is well put together, and replete with interest; and, further, we will venture to predict, that he who is induced, on our representation, to take it up, will not bring a railing accusation against us on the score of time lost or hours mis-spent in its perusal. But, on the subject of the volumes, the life and opinions of the great and good man, touching whom they bear record, we would willingly be more diffuse, convinced that his sentiments may be advantageously spread over a land, wherein there are many as anxious as he was to perform the arduous duties of their ministry, and well inclined, like him, to “live with God and nature, content with that communion,” heedless of the host of angry passions which flourish in a selfish and a wrangling world.

Born in 1644, and dying in 1713, Archbishop Sharpe, it will be allowed, lived in a period more chequered with events of high import than any similar space of time in the annals of British history. In an historical point of view, therefore, we strongly recommend the work, convinced that the sketch we are about to give, will, on that account, be received with additional interest. We are indebted to the Rev. T. Newcome, Rector of Shenly, for the arrangement of the valuable documents under consideration, documents on which we may implicitly rely, their authority being amply supported by proofs detailed in a preface extremely interesting, and creditable to its author.

Born at Bradford, February 16, 1644, the archbishop was there baptized according to the regular episcopal forms, a circumstance to which he always referred with pleasure, as the irregular administration of the rite, or its entire omission, was, at that time, frequent in all parts of the kingdom; and the fact is more re-

markable, because his father was not a little inclined to Puritanism, and a staunch supporter of the parliament party: so much so, that Lord Fairfax offered him a commission, which he would gladly have accepted, had not his wife, who was as staunch a royalist, put a decided and successful negative on the proceeding. She seems, indeed, to have been a woman of extraordinary parts and resolution, for, at the risk of incurring the displeasure (not to say worse) of the ruling powers and patrons of her husband's family, she not only persevered in a steady inflexible adherence to her own principles, but instilled into her son's mind that loyalty to the king, and respect for established usages, which formed a prominent feature in his character.

In justice to his father, it is but fair to add, that to him he was equally indebted, for an earnest and influential piety. If his mother taught him to love the liturgy in its spirit and truth, his father taught him how to practise it by his own example: there being something he noted

"in his father's manner of addressing himself to God, in secret,—something that smote his fancy so powerfully,—that he was wont to say himself, that the impressions he got whilst a child, from the visible earnestness and importunacy of his father in his private devotions, were so strong upon his mind as never to be worn out afterwards."—p. 6.

But this good was not imbibed without a portion of alloy. Together with his father's devotional feelings he inherited his ultra-Calvinistic notions, and becoming a convert to the doctrines of absolute and irresistible decrees, he went up to the University of Cambridge in 1660, in the sixteenth year of his age, a rigid predestinarian, ready to enter the lists with any opponent who might venture to doubt how the utter rejection and reprobation of many millions of our fellow creatures could possibly add to the glory of God. Fortunately, he there fell into the hands of a sensible tutor, Mr. Brooksbank, who

"encouraged his young pupil to resort freely to him for a solution of whatever difficulties he met with in the course of his studies."—p. 9.

Under the care of this worthy Mentor, he, by degrees, emancipated himself from the trammels of these dire dogmas, and, from that moment, we find his mind in a state of progressive and liberal expansion. He sought knowledge of every description, and amongst the students of his day, in the several branches of chemistry, botany, antiquarian research, and classical attainments, he stood unrivalled. We may collect from his lamentation, that the "study of mathematics was neglected while he was a youth," that analytic philosophy formed a less prominent feature in the

academical education of that university than it does at present, but

“ he had naturally so clear a head, and so good a taste,” that we are not surprised at his cultivating and admiring the new philosophy of Newton, “ of which he used frequently to discourse,” and of which he always spoke with great delight, as “ setting forth the Creator in the most beautiful light that it was possible for us to conceive him in, with respect to external nature.”—p. 10.

To a mind like his, the lighter as well as graver attainments of science and literature were equally acceptable; and, therefore,

“ he took great delight not only in poetry as long as he lived, but, while he was a youth, in plays and romances too; and whatever was calculated to smite the fancy and move the passions. He had a happy talent of doing this himself, whenever he proposed to stir the affections, (which he thought of great use in preaching;) and it may be observed, in some of his sermons, how much, and how successfully, he hath, upon occasion, laboured this point.”—p. 14.

In the following note to Burnet's History, vol. iii. p.100, we meet with a corroboration of this part of his character. “ He was a great reader of Shakspeare. Dr. Mangey, who had married his daughter, told me that he used to recommend to young divines the reading of the Scriptures and Shakspeare. And Dr. Lisle, bishop of Norwich, who had been chaplain at Lambeth to Archbishop Wake, told me, that it was often related there that Sharpe would say, that the Bible and Shakspeare made him Archbishop of York. His wonderful knowledge of human nature, the dignity and nobleness of his sentiments, and the amazing force and brightness of his expression, do indeed make Shakspeare to be a great pattern for the gravest and most solemn compositions.”

Having taken the degree of Master of Arts, in 1667, he was, by virtue of a faculty from the Archbishop of Canterbury, ordained deacon and priest on the same day, and, forthwith, became an inmate in the family of Sir Heneage Finch, then solicitor-general, as domestic chaplain and tutor to his sons, a situation highly respectable, and a period of life spent much to his satisfaction and improvement. His conduct, as might be expected, was such, as to insure the approbation of his patron, through whose application he was promoted to the Archdeaconry of Berks, a preferment followed up, in 1675, through the same interest, by his appointment to the rectory of St. Giles in the Fields; and, in the year following, he was married, by Dr. Tillotson, to a Mrs. Elizabeth Palmer; her mother being a puritan, and a particular friend and admirer of the famous Richard Baxter, “ would not consent to this treaty for her daughter till she

had consulted him." She did so accordingly, and Mr. Baxter, with the liberality so strongly depicted in his character, more particularly in the latter years of his life,

"not only consented and approved of the proposal, but such was the opinion he had of the Archdeacon, and such his esteem for him, that he told her, had he a daughter of his own to dispose of, he would not refuse her to Mr. Sharpe."—p. 28.

For the sixteen years during which he held the preferment of St. Giles's, it may be truly said, that he devoted his physical and mental energies to the service of his parishioners, frequently passing the greatest part of the night in his study.

"And now it was, and chiefly in those midnight hours which he borrowed from his rest, that he composed most of those discourses, which, afterwards, with a little revival and finishing, he made use of to his dying day."—p. 33.

Burnet, who was never thought partial to him, states, in the *History of his own Times*,

"He was both a very pious man, and one of the most popular preachers of the age, who had a peculiar talent of reading his sermons with much life and zeal."—vol. i. p. 674.

The following observations respecting his sermons are so admirable, that no apology is requisite for inserting them.

"He was careful and exact in the choice of his words, and used to say, that the point which put him most upon consideration in the making his sermons, was oftentimes how to make things plain enough, that is, to find out phrases suited and levelled to the capacities of the vulgar, and yet not vulgar enough themselves to offend the politest taste. He was not at a loss for words, significant and proper enough to express his sentiments, (and which came from him, with as much ease and readiness, as from any man living,) but he wanted to be understood by everybody, even his meanest auditors, at the first hearing, and to effect this, too, without using low and creeping similies, rustic phrases, or tedious repetitions, or, if possible, without impairing either the force of his argument or the beauty of his style. And whosoever can compass thus much, without weighing and adjusting his expressions before hand as well as his sentiments, has indeed a peculiar talent, and such as Dr. Sharpe never pretended to."—p. 39.

In the performance of the important duty of visiting the sick, we find him at all times actively employed; "though his compliance herein put him sometimes in hazard of his life," (p. 46,) occasionally exposing himself thereby to treacherous designs upon his person, "for it was at a particular time in King James's reign, when he had grounds for distrust," (p. 46,) and to the still greater

danger of contagion, for he never had the small pox. Amidst the variety of business which occupied his attention, he found but little time for his lighter pursuits; he contrived, however, to pay considerable attention to the study of coins and medals, so much so, that, in the latter part of his life, his collection, especially of the Saxon English coins, was inferior to few in England.

In 1681, he was appointed to the deanery of Norwich, at the joint intercession of the Duke of York, Lord Arlington, and his old and constant patron, the Lord Chancellor Finch. A preferment particularly acceptable, as affording opportunities of studying more at leisure than he could in town, at the same time recruiting his health, and relieving him from the fatigues of his parochial cure; and, what was still of more consequence to him, "of improving in his spiritual life, through the advantages of retirement, and disengagement from company and business."—p. 51.

About this period, he published some works of a controversial nature upon the subject of schism; but, however objectionable such publications must have been to the dissenters, some of whom immediately replied to his arguments, yet

"Mr. Sharpe had this benefit from his mild and inoffensive way of managing the subject, that his adversary treated him with a better temper, and in a gentler strain, than is usual with men of that persuasion."—p. 60.

On the death of King Charles II., in 1685, he drew up an address for the grand jury of the city of London upon his brother's happy accession, some passages of which admit the doctrine of passive obedience in its utmost extent, for which his biographer, however, makes the following defence.

"It has been remarked, that most of the addresses upon this occasion ran in a warm, some think too warm, a strain of loyalty. And possibly, some objections may be made to certain expressions of this address, of serving the king (as upon a foot of duty) to the utmost extremity. But it is to be remembered, that although no man had a more unshaken loyalty than Dr. Sharpe, or could be more firmly attached to the service and interests of his prince than he was; yet he never taught or held any principles of submission, but what were agreeable to the constitution. For he always laid down the laws of the land as the rule and measure of obedience. And, therefore, his general expressions should be understood with such limitation as the principles he professed, and to which he ever inviolably adhered, will admit of, or rather will confine them to."—p. 65.

The very year after this address was presented, Dr. Sharpe, happening to treat upon some points in the Romish controversy

in the pulpit, he fell under the displeasure of the king; and, together with his diocesan, was the first over whom the unprecedented authority and illegal power of the celebrated ecclesiastical commission was exercised. To add to the bitterness, as well as illegality of the proceedings, the Bishop of London, on the very day following the loss of two of Dr. Sharpe's sons in two successive days, received a royal command to suspend him forthwith "from further preaching in any parish church or chapel of his diocese" until he had given satisfaction to the king, whose further pleasure should be then known. The spirited reply of the Bishop of London ought not pass unnoticed; it was written to Lord Sunderland, president of the council, and forwarded by the hands of Dr. Sharpe.

"My Lord.—I always have and shall count it my duty to obey the king in whatever commands he lays upon me, that I can perform with a safe conscience. But in this I humbly conceive I am obliged to proceed according to LAW, and, therefore, it is impossible for me to comply, because, though his majesty commands me only to execute his pleasure, yet, in the capacity I am to do it, I must act as JUDGE. And your Lordship knows no judge condemns any man before he hath knowledge of the cause, and hath cited the party. However, I sent to Mr. Dean and acquainted him with his majesty's displeasure, whom I find so ready to give all reasonable satisfaction, that I have thought fit to make him the bearer of this answer, from him that will never be unfaithful to the king, or otherwise than—My Lord, Your Lordship's most humble servant, H. London."—p. 82.

On the same day the doctor drew up his own petition to the king, which, we are sorry to say, was couched in very different terms, and proves that there are times and seasons when the purest principles may lack the support of resolution. It was a doleful specimen of passive obedience.

"If, in any sermon," (to use his own words) "any words or expressions have unwarily slipped from him, liable to such construction as to give your majesty cause of offence, he earnestly prayeth, that your majesty, of your royal grace and clemency, would be pleased to lay aside the displeasure you have conceived against your humble petitioner, and restore him, &c. &c."—83.

His advocates may palliate the weakness into which he was thus betrayed, but the Christian world should be aware that there is a tribunal above all earthly thrones, before which the consciences of men are alone amenable.

It is with real pleasure we have to add, that on subsequent occasions Dr. Sharpe showed a firmness sufficient to efface the stigma which this event might have left on his character. This he had soon an opportunity of evincing, by refusing to appear

before the ecclesiastical commission, to show cause why he had not obeyed a royal order respecting that celebrated declaration, which led to the committal of the seven bishops in the year 1688. His reasons for refusing to appear are contained in a paper drawn up by him, either for his own defence or for the satisfaction of such as applied to him for advice on this occasion; but it is too long for insertion. This manly avowal of opinions was the more creditable, since we are told, "he never in his life meddled or interposed in affairs of state, further than was incumbent upon him by virtue of his station and office," (p. 96.) The great changes which soon afterwards ensued, rendered further resistance, on the part of the church, unnecessary. In a short space of time, those who had heretofore aided and abetted encroachments on the liberty of the subject, were called to an account for their conduct. Amongst others, the notorious Jefferies had been committed to the tower, where Dr. Sharpe, from a feeling of gratitude for private personal obligations, and remembering that this judge, though unjust to many, had been a friend to him in his own troubles, thought proper to evince his sense of past kindness by visiting him.

"My Lord was not a little surprised at his constancy, as appears by his salutation of him at his first entrance into the room, in these words, '*What! dare you own me now?*' The Doctor, seeing his condition, judged he should not lose the opportunity of being serviceable to his lordship as a divine, if it was in his power to be so; and freely expostulated with him upon his public actions, and '*particularly the affair in the west.*' To which last charge his lordship returned this answer: 'That he had done nothing in that affair without the advice and concurrence of who now,' said he, 'is the darling of the people.' His lordship further complained much of the reports that went about concerning him, particularly that of his giving himself up to hard drinking in his confinement, which he declared was grounded upon nothing more than his present seasonable use of punch, to alleviate the pressures of stone or gravel under which he then laboured."—97.

These were times when the consciences of the most upright must have been severely tried, and there probably never was a season in which a "ductor dubitantium" would have been more frequently referred to. The throne became vacant according to the vote of the House of Commons on Jan. 27th, and on the 30th, it so happened, that Dr. Sharpe, having on the preceding Sunday preached before the Prince of Orange, was appointed to preach before the House of Commons on Wednesday the 30th, during which interval, it should be observed, the service of the church had not been altered by authority, neither as yet had the Lords sanctioned the decisions of the lower House respecting the ques-

tion of abdication. Here then was a dilemma. Dr. Sharpe, however, without hesitation, both in presence of the prince and before the House of Commons, "did, as usual, pray for King James." The following memorandum, in Dr. Sharpe's own hand, is annexed to a copy of the vote of thanks which was passed on the occasion.

"This sermon here desired to be printed, was that which I preached on Jan. 30, after the House had made a vote, that King James had abdicated. Nevertheless, in my prayer before sermon, I prayed for King James as I used to do. At which, and, I believe, at some passages in the sermon, great offence was taken by several of the warm men in the House of Commons; and complaint was made by the speaker, Mr. Powel, to the House, that very afternoon. Upon which a great debate arose, which took up all their time that night, but nothing was concluded. The next day, being the 31st of January, was the day of thanksgiving for the arrival of the Prince of Orange. And then Dr. Burnet preached before the House. The day after, when the House was set, the first motion that was made was for thanks, &c., for my sermon, which produced this vote. Sir John Knight made the motion. *But for all this order I did not print my sermon.*"—p. 99.

In the following year he was appointed to the deanery of Canterbury, on the removal of Dr. Tillotson to that of St. Paul's, and soon after he was selected by the king to supply one of the sees vacated by the "deprivations of the bishops." Whatever blame we might have for a moment attached to him in a case already mentioned, his conduct on this occasion was beyond all praise, for although two or three were offered,

"he waved all these offers on account of the dispossessed bishops being yet alive, with whom he was acquainted, and for whom he bore respect: and as to Norwich, in particular, he declared, that having lived hitherto in great friendship with its bishop, he could not think of taking his place, but rather chose to continue in his present situation, than remove to more honourable posts under such circumstances as made them no ways tempting to him, or agreeable to his inclination."—p. 108.

It is to be regretted, that the cold apathetic mind of the new monarch was proof against such a display of amiable and praiseworthy feelings. On the contrary, they excited his displeasure; for we are told, the king was "not a little disgusted at his peremptory refusal of those preferments," (p. 109,) and but for the active interference of Dr. Tillotson, here, in all probability, Dr. Sharpe had forfeited all further favours from court; but by the judicious management of this his never failing friend, his steady refusal of preferment under existing circumstances became the means of a still greater, and a still more unexpected advancement, for on the death of Archbishop Lampleugh, he was, in May, 1691, in the

47th year of his age, appointed to the see of York, which high station he held for twenty-two years.

The Second Part of the work commences at this period, and contains his character as bishop, and his proceedings in his diocese. At his entrance upon this great charge, he laid down to himself certain rules. One was for the encouragement of the clergy, viz. to "bestow the prebends in his gift upon such only as were either beneficed in his diocese or retained in his family." The other, more properly, respected the laity, viz. "never to meddle or anywise concern himself in the election of members of parliament." To the former determination, with the exception of an appointment of two of his former pupils, the Hon. Mr. H. and the Hon. Mr. E. Finch, connexions, it will be remembered, of that family to which he owed all he had, he adhered so strictly, that of forty-six stalls which he filled, in less than half that number of years, all were filled agreeably to the foregoing resolution, and the candidates for them were invariably selected from such as lived in his diocese, and had recommended themselves to him by doing their duties in their respective parochial cures.

The promotion of his clergy was also marked by respect for their freedom of opinion, as he ever "guided himself in dispensing his favours to them, not by their political principles, but by their moral characters and parochial labours."—(p. 140.) He was wont to address them in a frank, ingenuous, kind and affectionate manner; hoping they

"would take in good part his freedom, and plainness wherewith he delivered himself; declaring it was not a humour of talking magisterially that put him upon it, but a sense of his own duty, and a hearty good will to them; that he had no design upon earth but that both they and himself might be good, and adorn the profession to which they were called."—p. 154.

His knowledge of human nature and the world led him to dislike and discourage societies for the reformation of manners.

"He was unwilling to check well-meaning people in any design that seemed to tend to God's honour and the good of mankind, and yet he feared whereunto the liberty that those societies begun to take *would grow*."—p. 170.

We wish our limits would allow us to insert the whole of an interesting correspondence between himself and certain clergymen, who, with more zeal than judgment, had established a society of this description; but we must satisfy ourselves with a few extracts illustrative of his meaning.

"I must confess, (says he,) I think it is of a great deal more consequence. I.—JAN. 1827.

quence, both to a man's self and to the public, that he use all means possible to be devout, humble, charitable, and (in a word) in all things to live like a Christian himself, than to be zealous in *informing against others* who do not live like Christians. The first is of certain benefit, both to a man's self and others; but the other may be often indiscreet and vexatious."—p. 175.

Again—

"I myself have always been averse to such sort of confederacies or combinations, whether of clergy or others, as are now *on foot every where*, whether they be those they call Religious Societies or those of a later standing, which go under the name of Societies for Reformation; as doubting whether they be legal in themselves, and apprehending, likewise, that some time or other we may feel ill consequences from them."—p. 182.

Here again we cannot but notice his respect for the opinions of others; for, notwithstanding his own views, he adds—

"Nevertheless, being sensible that a great *many wise and good men* do approve of these societies, I will not think the worse of any man for engaging in them. Nor shall these societies meet with any discouragement from me, so long as they keep within the bounds which the laws of the land and of the Church have prescribed."—p. 185.

We come now to Part III., containing his more public transactions in Church and State.

Having borne testimony to the simplicity of his character in his more private capacity, we are now to follow him into the wider ocean of public life; and there we are gratified with a similar display of purity and disinterestedness, only to be fully appreciated by those who are aware of the temptations to which men in high office are exposed, and the frailty of human nature when it meets them in its pathway. We have seen him, in a former period of his life, extending his views of allegiance to its utmost verge; but this he did, most unquestionably, from a deep and overpowering sense of duty. But although no one could be more averse than he was to party spirit, he was generally considered a party man. "Those who were called the Tories, or the High Church party, claimed him as theirs;" for he was observed more generally to approve and favour their principles, and to go more along with them, than those of the other side: but he was never known to oppose any man of real worth upon account of party distinctions; nor would he consent even to the recommendation of royalty itself, when candidates were named for office whose religious principles or morals were ill spoken of or suspected, though they were otherwise of great abilities,—"*useful to the ministry or favoured at court.*"—(p. 335.) Few, we fear

would have taken upon themselves to be so explicit as he was in remonstrating with the very highest person in the kingdom. In the case of Sir John Fenwick, the King spoke to him and the Bishop of Norwich, and

“did with a great deal of earnestness (as he expresses it,) recommend the passing the bill of attainder (against him); telling them how much his government was concerned in it. I then told him, (he adds,) that I had always, in my own mind, been against bills of attainder. He bid us consider well of the thing, and he hoped we would.”—p. 295.

But notwithstanding this strong hint, Dr. Sharpe without hesitation voted against it; eight more of the bishops acted with equal spirit, in opposition to the rest of the bench, one of whom, the Bishop of Sarum, so “grievously resented” Dr. Sharpe’s vote, “that it occasioned some little ruffle between them, either in the House or in the lobby.” Again, in his diary, Feb. 2, 1707-8, we find the following:—

“At Kensington the queen pressed me to serve her in voting against the bill to dissolve the Scotch council. I begged of her majesty not to lay her commands upon me, for I must vote according to my judgment, and according as I am satisfied what is for the interest of her majesty and of the kingdom, for I would make no distinction between them.”—p. 303.

And a few pages after, we read—

“I had a great deal of talk (with the queen); I assured her that I loved her, and would do her all the service that I could. Nay, and if she should use me ill, I should always behave myself like a dutiful subject. She told me she hoped I would always do what she desired: I told her, if she desired reasonable things, I would. . . . and that I must be satisfied in my own judgment that they were reasonable, for I acted upon principles, and must satisfy my own conscience.”—p. 322.

The editor observes, on some of these cases, that it will be very natural for those who consider him as attached to a party, to interpret all these reserves to his own judgment as the “effect of a resolution” not to drop the Tories; but this was not the case, for he not only frequently voted against them, “but would exert his interest too in opposition to them, as often as he judged they were taking wrong steps.”—p. 304.

Much against his inclination, he accepted in 1702, at the queen’s earnest request, the situation of almoner to her majesty; and in a few days subsequent, was sworn at the chancery bar for the office of commissioner for the Scotch Union; and soon afterwards he was again sworn a privy counsellor.

For that “glorious and ever memorable” act, as it is styled, of

the queen's reign, commonly called her "Bounty," the Church is very considerably indebted to the share he had in procuring and arranging the act for that purpose. The idea was, indeed, originally from Dr. Burnet, in the late reign, as the reader will find on referring to his work;* but to Dr. Sharpe we are perhaps equally indebted for its completion, as he most sedulously watched over the progress of the bill, "continuing very active in whatever related to the completing the design."

About this period a convocation was much talked of, for settling various points connected with the interests of the Church in the way of amendment, alterations, &c.; but after much discussion, it fell through. The archbishop, indeed, did not manifest any extraordinary zeal in bringing it about, being probably apprehensive that the times in which he lived were not quite "seasonable for such proposals." His opinion of the Established Church will best appear from his own words, delivered upon a very solemn occasion and in a very solemn manner.

"If we take our measures, (says he,) concerning the truths of religion, from the rules of the Holy Scriptures and the platform of the primitive Churches, the Church of England is undoubtedly, both as to its doctrine and worship, the purest Church that is at this day in the world; the most orthodox in faith, and the freest, on the one hand, from idolatry and superstition, and on the other hand, from freakishness and enthusiasm, of any now extant. Nay, I do further say, with great seriousness, and as one that expects to be called to account at the dreadful tribunal of God for what I now say if I do not speak in sincerity, that I do in my conscience believe, that if the religion of Jesus Christ, as it is delivered in the New Testament, be the true religion, (as I am certain it is,) then the Communion of the Church of England is a safe way to salvation, and the safest of any I know in the world."—p. 354.

We have before noticed his disapprobation of those injudicious ministers who sought to attract his notice and secure his favour by railing against dissenters, to which they were possibly urged by a prevailing opinion that he "was a warm man against sectarists;" but this opinion of him seems rather to be grounded upon another equally mistaken one, viz. his supposed inviolable attachment to a party, than upon any just reasons. It is true, he pressed his arguments against separation and schism with warmth and earnestness in his sermons and writings; but it will be seen in them, also, with how mild a temper and with how Christian a spirit he treats the dissenters themselves. He compassionates their weakness, but never exclaims at their obstinacy, or attempts to raise resentment or indignation against them. He never

* *Burnett's Own Times*, 8vo. edit. vol. 5. p. 119.

treated them, or spoke of them, but with that calm spirit which visibly runs through his writings; and as he hated every thing

“that bordered upon bitterness or violence, so he was even shocked to hear them vilified and maltreated in the pulpit, which he abhorred should be prostituted to such purposes.”—p. 357.

Upon the much-contested subject of Lay Baptism, we find his own opinion, similar to that of the Archbishop of Canterbury and other heads of the Church, thus expressed in his diary, dated April 22, 1712:—

“At eleven o’clock I went to Lambeth. We were in all thirteen bishops. We had a long discourse about lay baptism, which of late hath made such a noise about the town. We all agreed that baptism by any other person except lawful ministers ought, as much as may be, to be discouraged; nevertheless, whoever was baptized by any other person, and in that baptism the essentials of baptism were preserved, that is, being dipped or sprinkled in the name of the Father, &c., such baptism was valid, and ought not to be repeated. This, indeed, is the sense of the Church of England, as will appear to any person who considers the rubrics in the office for private baptism, and compares them with one another and with the previous questions in the office itself. From all which laid together it may be plainly collected, that where the essentials, matter and form, have been preserved, though administered by another hand than that of a lawful minister, the baptism shall not be so much as hypothetically repeated; yet, nevertheless, it is so far condemned and disapproved, as irregular and uncanonical, that the child or person so baptized shall not be received into the congregation: but the officiating minister shall have recourse to the directions of his ordinary, as in other irregular, and uncommon, and difficult cases. But as our Church hath no where openly and expressly declared for the validity of lay baptism, or allowed it to be administered by laymen in any case, how extraordinary soever, some handle is left for disputing or speaking doubtfully about her sense of the matter.”—p. 371.

The result of this conversation was, that the Archbishop of Canterbury and a few other bishops drew up a declaration, expressing an opinion

“That such persons as have already been baptized in or with water, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, ought not to be baptized again,” &c.

On receiving a copy of this declaration, Dr. Sharpe wrote to the archbishop, stating—

“That to leave the question as much undecided as it is left in the public offices and canons of the Church, was a good security to discipline; and that an open declaration in favour of the dissenters’ baptism might prove inconvenient, from the bad use that might be made of it.”—p. 374.

The next business in which we find him taking a prominent part, was in favour of the Episcopal Clergy of Scotland, who, by his active interference, were relieved from those severities with which they had been before treated. In testimony of which, a letter is annexed, from the clergy of the diocese of Aberdeen, acknowledging that "to the happy effect of his grace's friendly endeavours" they were indebted for an extension of the queen's private bounty towards them, especially to the bishops of Edinburgh and Aberdeen, and to the only surviving archbishop of Scotland, Dr. John Paterson, Archbishop of Glasgow, burthened with age and infirmities, eleven children and great poverty, for whom was procured a grant of £300 per annum, out of the rents of his archbishopric, during his life, and £200 per annum, for fifteen years more, towards the support and maintenance of his children. It will be gratifying to those who have been and still are interested in the cause of those suffering and patient Christians, the Vaudois, to learn that from Dr. Sharpe they experienced the most marked attention and most lively sympathy. King William and Queen Mary had granted all their reign, or at least for many years of it, a pension of £425 to these people. But this pension having been struck off, when he came to be made almoner to the queen, he put into her hand a memorial of the pensions that had been paid in the late reign, among which he set down this to the Vaudois: but this taking no effect, he not only wrote to the lord treasurer, but subsequently pressed the queen so closely upon the subject, that she consented to continue the payment.

In 1706 we find him busily employed in aiding the dissolved Greek Churches in Armenia and Egypt, and in an attempt, which unfortunately failed, of introducing the Liturgy of the Church of England into Prussia;—it is given in detail, together with the correspondence of the several parties concerned in the transaction, and with this ends the first volume.

We have, hitherto, considered Dr. Sharpe in his public, rather than his private character, as he was before men. The second volume (and we think it the most interesting) exhibits him in the more retired walks of life, not only in his intercourse with those friends who shared his affections and confidence, but in communion also with himself in the inner man of the heart. It consists, as the Editor informs us, of some few memorials of his private friendship, correspondence, benefactions, and such personal qualities as recommended him to the world as a private man; to which is added, a short account of his spiritual or religious life.

In entering upon this department of our duty, we must confess that we feel at a loss where to draw the limit, and where to check our pen in its gratifying task of inditing the praises of one to

whom so much praise is justly due. We will commence with his simplicity, a prominent virtue in his character. Thus it stands recorded.

“He had nothing of intrigue in his temper; nothing covert or suspicious, either in his discourse or in his outward demeanour; had no notion of perplexing or amusing those he conversed with by any kind of disguise, but was, in every instance, and throughout his whole conduct, a man without guile. It has already been observed, that such an open and artless conduct might prove a disadvantage to him in his conferences and correspondences with the courtiers; and his utter want of some degree of polite subtlety might be interpreted as a diminution of his abilities for public service. However that was, they who valued themselves most on their dexterity of address, could not have a meaner opinion of his simplicity, than he had of every species of dissimulation, not excepting the most refined. Double meanings and evasions could never be so elegantly and speciously dressed up as to hide their ill shapes and deformity from his eyes. The finest parts and rarest endowments lost most of their merit with him, if they did not appear accompanied with sincerity, singleness and uprightness of design; which are the chief beauty and only real worth both of words and actions.”—p. 2.

His conversational talents may be estimated by their effect upon those who were fortunate enough to share his society. For he

“never refused to converse with any who were admitted to him with great cheerfulness and condescension; and he had this peculiar happiness, that though he talked so much, and in so free and open, and, in appearance, careless a manner, yet he did it with so great a guard upon himself, that he hardly ever gave offence to any that sat with him, and very rarely occasion to reproach himself for his inadvertency. His conversation, too, was contrived and adapted for the entertainment of all that heard him;” and, in his introduction of serious subjects, he was so prudent, “both as to measure and manner, that it was disagreeable to none, but welcome to most.” Yet, though such were his “darling subjects,” there was no topic so “trifling, and so much out of his own way, but he would pleasantly enter into it, for the sake of making himself agreeable to such as were addicted to this sort of conversation and pleased with it. A noted fox hunter, in Yorkshire, that dined with him, was surprised at his entertaining him so suitably with a discourse about horses, and said, after he came away, that surely the Archbishop had been reading the *Gentleman’s Jockey*.”—p. 51.

To his clergy, too, he was invariably affable and hospitable.

“The meanest man in his diocese who wore a gown” being welcome “at his table as often as he pleased;” and was received with as much kindness and civility as if “providence had set them both upon a level.” p. 52.

It is almost unnecessary to add, that in such a character charity, in the widest sense of the word, shone pre-eminent; it was not merely the charity of imparting aid to those who were in want, it was charity in the gospel sense of the word, it was good will to man founded on love to God. The Editor classes it under three heads:—1. Resolving doubts and removing unnecessary scruples of conscience. 2. Making peace in divided families, by accommodating their differences. 3. Acts of liberality and charity to persons in want. Proofs of these are annexed, with some interesting letters in the Appendix, exemplifying his mode of proceeding under the second head of the above division. His actual disbursements under the third head were astonishing; he decimated, in the first place, the whole profits of his preferments and estates, the distribution of which fund was exclusive of most liberal donations in numberless other cases, particularly to his poorer clergy.

Such are a few of the traits which marked the character of this excellent man. We would willingly, as we have before hinted, be more diffuse; but our pages admonish us that we are drawing near to the prescribed limits of our praise. We shall, therefore, conclude this part of our subject in the words of his biographer:

“By these acts of piety and charity that were known, let those be measured, or guessed at, that were not known.”—p. 60.

From his deeds we would now follow him to his thoughts: and it is not often that a biographer is enabled to do this; but happily, in the present instance, we have it in our power to show, not only what he was before men, but before God. We allude to an invaluable portion of the work before us, consisting of copious extracts from a private journal, in which he was in the habit of recording his thoughts and observations upon almost every transaction public and private in which he was engaged. This diary, it is observed, will

“form a guide able to conduct us into his retirements, and to show him in some of his private communications with heaven, and of his most secret acts of religion.”—p. 62.

They, indeed, who make light of private devotions, and of all human endeavours to keep up a constant and daily intercourse with heaven, will, of course, pass over this part of the memoirs. This apprehension, it seems, pressed so strongly on the compiler, that he had serious thoughts of suppressing these extracts from the diary; his motive we respect and can fully enter into; but we rejoice that he was finally prevailed upon to dis-

regard it. It appears that in 1688, the 44th year of his age, Dr. Sharpe began to enter into a more extraordinary course of devotion and private exercise of piety than he had practised before that time. By a reflection upon his own past life, minuted 1682, we indeed learn that he had for several years lived "very carefully;" but well is it remarked, that the charge of a large parish, with all its routine of duties, together with repeated disappointments and interruptions, and the controversies of those times, were enough to disconcert and estrange his mind from that placid state of piety which a Christian should ever aim at and covet. The reader may be curious to learn the scenes and spots consecrated by his hallowed aspirations:—

"In the summer time, when he resided at Bishopsthorp, and when the weather was fair, he usually offered these thanksgivings *sub dio*, either in his garden or in the adjoining fields and meadows, whither he frequently walked to perform his devotions."—p. 78.

Again, when the plantations which he had made in his garden were grown up to some perfection, he changed the scene of his thanksgivings, and offered them up in a particular walk, which from thence he called his "temple of praise." It was a close grass-plot walk, lying north and south, and hedged on each side with yew, so thick and high as to be completely shaded at all times of the day except noon. On the east it had a little maze or wilderness that grew considerably. The entrance into it at each end was through arches made in a lime hedge, and the view through these arches immediately bounded by a hedge of horn-beam at one end, and a fruit wall on the other. So that from within the walk, scarce any thing was to be seen but verdure and the open sky above. In this close walk, and in the adjoining maze, we are assured he spent many a happy hour, especially in the last years of his life. Thus, for instance, he notes in 1712:—

"After evening prayers I walked in my garden, and there, in my temple of praise, poured out my soul to God in an unusual ardent manner, so that I think I was never so rapturously devout in my life."—p. 79.

And again, the parish church of Acaster, rurally situated in the fields, within a short mile of his palace, was another favourite spot. Thither he frequently retired alone, and made its little porch his oratory. We believe there are few amongst our readers who, knowing the charm of going forth to meditate at eventide, have not, like the Archbishop, selected their own secluded spots, in which they hear a voice we cannot hear, and see a hand we cannot see,—spots in which thoughts and deeds of times passed make their deep and lasting impressions; and amongst these

the retirement of a country church has attractions which few can resist.

We have hitherto, with one exception, been silent respecting his failings; but we rather gladly allude to another as evidence in favour of his superiority and strength of character, fully agreeing with the editor, that if

“any impartial person should know all his failures, with his conduct of or under them, he would rather admire and love him the more, than esteem him the less for them.”—p. 89.

It will scarcely be believed then that his prevailing infirmity was passion:—

“the most prevalent in his nature was choler; but he so managed and subdued it, that oftentimes when he was angry, it could hardly be perceived that his passion was stirred.”—p. 89.

He who can at all times thus subdue his angry feelings, and controul the overflowings of an irritable temper, has achieved a victory which renders the minor skirmishes with our failings comparatively insignificant.

We have now one other scene of his life to touch upon, but it is the most important, being that of his transition from his earthly to his heavenly state. At the close of 1713 his appetite failed him, and he grew very weak and exceedingly dispirited. On Sunday, Dec. 6, he attended service in his chapel for the last time; and on the Wednesday following, after making some alterations in his will, he concluded his diary (his hand being grown so unsteady that his characters are scarcely legible,) with these words:—

“All well, I thank God; but I am horribly dull and dispirited as ever a poor man was.”—p. 91.

The next day, by the advice of his physicians, he set out for Bath, but his strength decreased, his memory decayed—his hour was evidently nigh at hand, and human means of no avail. The approach of death was however gradual; he grew daily weaker and weaker: all that was particularly observed by those about him was, that he “prayed continually;” and the chief token by which they perceived how his strength declined was, “his shortening of his prayers.” A little before he expired, he told his lady that “he should be happy.” The last words he said were those of Mr. Herbert—“Ah, my dear God, though I am clean forgot,” &c. He had these words often in his mouth while he was in health; but would add, that Mr. Herbert was much dispi-

rited when he wrote them. He departed this life Feb. 2, 1713, aged 69.

We wish for a moment to turn the reader's attention to his dying words and feelings. It will be observed that so far from being in a strain of exultation and confidence, they are rather doubtful, not to say desponding in their style. What are we to infer from this? that such men as Dr. Sharpe and Mr. Herbert were unprepared for death, or in a state which justified such an absence of confidence and reasonable assurance? By no means: and we allude to it for the very purpose of contrasting these dying Christians' feelings with those which are daily forced upon our attention in the published narratives of criminals whose lives have been little else than a continued series of vice. Scarcely an assize elapses but the pages of the Newgate Calendar announce in rhapsodies the happy deaths of murderers, and the exulting assurance of the most abandoned criminals that all will be well with them. Far be it from us to limit the power, intentions, or mercy of the Almighty, but we would put it to the sound judgment and common sense of the more sober and rational of those at whose suggestion this confidence is imparted, whether they act wisely or discreetly in so doing? He who stands upon the very verge and threshold of eternity—who is upon the point of quitting his frail and sinful tenement of earth for the unspotted purity of the World of Spirits, ought to be, and must be, unless his mind is in a state of enthusiastic aberration, impressed with an awful sense of his situation, and a decent sobriety, utterly at variance with the wild exultation of absolute certainty. He will, with a humble and entire reliance on his Saviour, be preparing to meet his God: but while with the dying Christian before us, he trusts that "all is well," and expresses a hope of happiness, as a convicted criminal suffering for his misdeeds, he should also in a tenfold degree feel that he is in "a low state, a poor man dull and dispirited," and his soul ought not, when he dwells upon the past, to be without its peculiar disquietings. And surely such would be fitter and more appropriate sentiments and feelings to encourage and instil than those to which we have alluded; feelings which were never sanctioned by him who died upon the Cross, and which must in many cases operate as a fatal delusion to the living, and, for what we know, may lead the dying and the dead to fearful disappointment and endless remorse.

ART. III. — *Critical Essays on Genesis, Ch. xx., and on St. Matthew, Ch. ii. 17. 18., with Notes.* By the Rev. CHARLES FORSTER, B.D. Chancellor of Ardfert, and Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Limerick. Dublin, Milliken. London, T. Cadell. Svo. pp. 80. 4s.

THE professed aim of Mr. Forster in the publication of these Essays, is to lower the estimation of the modern system of biblical criticism. With this view he endeavours to weaken our confidence in the judgment of its founder, by an examination of his hypothesis with respect to the twentieth chapter of Genesis: and to detract from the value of one of its favourite theories, by showing, that its assistance is not required in one of the instances in which the majority of modern commentators have most willingly resorted to its aid; namely, in the exposition, or rather, the explaining away of the declaration of St. Matthew, (ch. ii. 17, 18,) that in the murder of the Innocents at Bethlehem a remarkable prophecy of Jeremiah was “fulfilled.”

The hypothesis of Simon (the reputed father of the school to which Mr. Forster alludes) with respect to the twentieth chapter of Genesis, as stated in his “*Histoire Critique*,” is, that it has suffered transposition, and now occupies a different situation in the text, from that in which it was originally placed by its author. His idea of the origin of this supposed perturbation of the order of Scripture will be noticed hereafter; for the present it will be sufficient to observe, that as Simon produces the example of this chapter, as the “*foundational evidence*” of the existence of the evil, to account for which his general theory is proposed; it is clear, that if the example itself be found inefficient for its purpose, our confidence in the discretion of one, who thus brings forward a theory, however ingenious, to account for a fact, the very existence of which is problematical, will be very materially shaken.

Mr. Forster, therefore, in the former of the two Essays before us, undertakes to show, that the transposition in question is not only uncalled for by the necessity, but untenable upon a fair statement of the probabilities, of the case; and, in this view, first directs his attention to the subversion of the only argument alleged by Simon in its favour, and upon which that learned critic is content to rest his cause. This argument is, in fact, no other than an assumption of the impossibility of Sarah’s being, at the advanced age at which the transaction took place, the object of Abimelec’s love. “*Il est dit*,” says Simon, “*que le roi Abimelec*

devint amoureux de Sara: et cependant l'historien avoit déjà dit, un peu auparavant, que Sara et Abraham étoient fort avancés en âge." The age of Abraham himself, at this time, appears, from Gen. xvii. 1, to have been ninety-nine; and, from Gen. xvii. 17, we learn, that Sarah was ten years younger than her husband.

In reply to this incomparable argument for the transposition contended for, it might seem sufficient, with Mr. Forster, to observe, that, taking the other parts of the book in which it is recorded as they stand, the age of Sarah, compared with the then ordinary durations of life, did not exceed that, at which experience shows it not to be uncommon, even now, for women to become the objects of very passionate admiration: nay, that particular examples might be cited from more modern histories, of females who retained their charms to an age, *comparatively*, far exceeding that of Sarah. But in the case before us it should more especially be remembered, that, though both Abraham and Sarah had indeed, before the revelation of her approaching conception, given up the hope of children, their journey to Gerar took place, after so much at least of the vigour, if not the comeliness, of youth had been restored to the latter as is implied in her becoming a mother. The whole affair, which Simon seems most unaccountably to have forgotten, was miraculous; and, to quote the just observations of Mr. Forster upon it,

"it would be doing sad injustice to the present subject, to speak of Abraham and Sarah as of ordinary human beings. By the pre-ordination and solemn benediction of Jehovah, these favoured individuals had been set apart to become the ancestors of God's chosen people,—to become the parents of the promised seed. It seemed fitting to unerring Wisdom to prove the faith of the patriarch, by withholding from his earnest expectation the heir of the promise, until both father and mother 'were well stricken in years.' But Divine Providence generally employs natural and ordinary means, for the accomplishment even of its most extraordinary dispensations. Sarah, therefore, being constituted, from the beginning, the pre-appointed mother of the Child of Promise, we may well conceive the counsels of the Divine Disposer to have so ordered it, that her constitution should be originally endued with, and should retain, to the appointed period of the birth of Isaac, a buoyancy and freshness, which would discover themselves in the life and freshness of her countenance and port. It is remarkable, that Abimelec saw her in the very year which immediately preceded the birth of Isaac; between the periods of God's last renewal of the promise unto Abraham, and of its blessed consummation: an interval in which, if at any one moment in the life of Sarah, the agency of the heavenly blessing must be presumed to have been peculiarly operative in renovating her frame." —pp. 19, 20.

In illustration of the *miraculous* preservation of health and

strength to a very advanced age, in a much later period of the sacred history, Mr. Forster notices the striking declaration of Caleb to Joshua, when he claimed of him the land, which forty-five years before had been promised to him, as the reward of his faithful execution of his trust, when sent with the other spies to view the Land of Promise. "Behold," says he, "*the Lord hath kept me alive*, as he said, these forty and five years; and now, lo, I am this day *fourscore and five years old*. As yet I am as strong this day, as I was in the day that Moses sent me; AS MY STRENGTH WAS THEN, EVEN SO IS MY STRENGTH NOW, FOR WAR."—Josh. xiv. 10, 11. And in like manner we are told of Moses himself, that, though "an hundred and twenty years old when he died, *his eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated*."—Deut. xxxiv. 7.

With respect, however, to one point, the assumption of Simon that Abimelec was *in love with* (amoureux de) Sarah, and that therefore we must suppose, "que Dieu avoit rendu à Sara toute la beauté qu'elle avoit eue dans sa jeunesse;" we cannot help observing, in support of Mr. Forster's argument, that it does not appear from the history, either, that it was any remarkable beauty of Sarah that influenced Abimelec, or, that he was indeed *in love with* her at all. He seems rather, according to the custom of the country, to have "sent and taken" her, almost as a matter of course, upon her arrival within his dominion. This was at least so usual, that Abraham, to all appearance, expected it as much now, as he did on a former occasion, when he went down into Egypt: and provided against any evil, which, in such a state of society, might be likely to happen to himself, by a similar stratagem. An incident of the same kind is recorded in the life of Isaac; and from the general tone of the narrative one should almost be led to imagine, that the single restriction in this respect imposed, whether by the manners or the religion of the times, on these barbarous and petty kings, was with reference to the *wife* of another; a restriction, by the way, which seems, at times, to have put the life of the husband himself in jeopardy. With such a license existing, we need hardly be surprised at any anomaly which might grow out of it, and the mere waywardness of unrestrained indulgence might, without the supposition of any *particular* attraction in the object, sufficiently account, were it necessary, or were the thing itself probably to be inferred from the narrative, even for Abimelec's assumed *love* for Sarah.

Mr. Forster may therefore well pronounce P. Simon's application of his theory of transposition to the twentieth chapter of Genesis, to be "altogether needless," alike "uncalled for by the circumstances and reason of the case."—p. 23.

But having shown it to be "*unnecessary*," he proceeds to demonstrate that it would be "*absurd*."

To render intelligible his very ingenious and most satisfactory reasoning in this part of his Essay, it will now be necessary to state, how, in the opinion of P. Simon, the dislocation of the passage, for which he contends, probably originated. This he refers to the mode in which the earlier books were written and put together. "*On écrivoit autrefois*," he observes, "*les livres sur de petites feuilles, qu'on se contentoit le plus souvent de rouler les unes sur les autres, autour d'un petit bâton, sans les coudre ensemble. Il est arrivé que comme on n'a pas eu assez de soin de conserver l'ordre de ces anciennes feuilles au rouleaux, la disposition des matières a reçu quelque changement.*"

If no other security for their preserving their right order existed, than the care which might be taken in rolling and unrolling these "*historical fragments*," for the purpose of reading or consultation, the chance of their retaining their proper stations might seem perhaps but small. Still, whatever derangement may have been subsequently introduced, at the time of composition, at least, the several portions of the history would naturally occur in their right order. It becomes the duty of a true critic, therefore, in any case of uncertainty subsequently arising, to inquire, whether or not there be any thing in the writing or composition itself, which may enable us to fix, with certainty or probability, according to the circumstances of the case, the true position of the supposed dislocated passage. It is in the discovery and application of such a verification of the place which the passage before ought to fill, and consequent justification of the actual state of the sacred text, that Mr. Forster is, we think, eminently happy. Simon does not venture to say where he would have it stand; but his argument against its present situation implies, that it must be placed "*somewhere prior to the seventeenth chapter; the latter chapter, and to verse 5 of the twenty-first inclusive, undeniably containing the occurrences of one and the same year.*" Now, that such a position of the chapter is impossible, Mr. Forster thus demonstrates:

"In the seventeenth chapter I pause upon a circumstance, minute indeed, yet among the most remarkable and most worthy of remark, of the biographical incidents connected with the history of the Father of the Faithful. I speak of the two-fold commandment given by Jehovah, in the course of this memorable interview between God and his chosen servant, that '*Abram*' and '*Sarai*' should thenceforward lay aside those names, received from man, and derived through heathen ancestors, and should receive and adopt other names, conferred on them by the voice of the Most High God, and imposed by the present ministration of Heaven. '*And Abram* fell on his face; and God talked with him, saying: As for

me, behold, my covenant is with thee, and thou shalt be a father of many nations. Neither shall thy name be any more called *Abram*; but thy name shall be *ABRAHAM*: for a father of many nations have I made thee.' (Gen. xvii. 3—5.) 'And God said unto *ABRAHAM*, As for *Sarai* thy wife, thou shalt not call her name *Sarai*, but *SARAH* shall her name be.' (Gen. xvii. 15.)

"The proverbial reverence of the ancient Jewish copyists for the integrity of the sacred text, (a reverence which, to this day, sets at defiance all imputation of wilful deliberate falsification of MSS. in the execution of their task,) is matter of unquestioned notoriety. But if ever there was an occasion more imperative than another for the exercise of this reverential accuracy of transcription, it may unhesitatingly be placed in the religious preservation of the distinction between the humanly-bestowed and the divinely-appointed names of the Father and the Mother of the faithful. *The single letters* added in the one instance (*אברהם*), and substituted in the other (*שרי שרה*), by the instant commandment of Jehovah, *must* have acquired and retained, in the eyes of Jewish piety and patriotism, on every principle of conscience and prepossession of the heart, which characteristically distinguished *the Israelite* from the rest of mankind, a value and a sacredness incommunicably and unchangeably their own.

"In the controverted narrative of the present twentieth chapter of Genesis, the divinely-enlarged name *ABRAHAM*, and the divinely-altered name *SARAH*, recur, the former in eight, the latter in five, several examples. The theoretical translocation proposed for our adoption, in this instance, by P. Simon, will require that we throw back this twentieth chapter to a place in the sacred history *certainly* prior to the seventeenth. But the seventeenth chapter, we have seen, contains the record of that interview in which Almighty God imposed their prophetic and spiritual names on his chosen servant and handmaiden: consequently, in order to the establishment of P. Simon's hypothesis of an accidental translocation of Gen. xx., we are driven upon the monstrous assumption, that *by the Jewish transcribers*, within the compass of a single chapter, the integrity of the sacred text, in one of its most sacred and inviolable features, has been wilfully and deliberately invaded and violated through a series of THIRTEEN DISTINCT EXAMPLES,—has been *wilfully* and *deliberately* invaded and violated, in five instances by literal substitutions, and in eight instances by literal additions."—pp. 24—27.

A more complete refutation of an unfounded, though plausible theory, than that contained in the above extract, will not easily be found in the annals of theological controversy, nor perhaps a more effectual warning against the "wanton attempts" of Simon and his followers, "to make order give place to confusion, fact to hypothesis, the sacred truth of history to the fallacies of a daring speculation."—p. 27.

But it is time to turn to the second of the two Essays, in which Mr. Forster considers the connexion between the prophecy of Jeremiah, (ch. xxxi. 15.) with respect to the voice of weeping

heard in Ramah, and the account given by St. Matthew (ch. ii.) of the slaughter of the Innocents at Bethlehem. The view taken by Mr. Forster of this connexion is, we believe, original; and even those who, with ourselves, find difficulty in subscribing to this interpretation of St. Matthew's allusion, will have none, we think, in admitting its ingenuity, or the ability with which every suggestion in its favour is brought forward. The point which Mr. Forster endeavours to establish will be best understood from his own statement of his hypothesis.

"It appears to me," says the learned writer, "to be a very inadequate mode of considering the present subject, to refer our inquiries to the prophecy of Jeremiah, and to the event which this prophecy is understood to have immediately predicted, without reverting at the same time to the historical incident on which the prophecy, Jer. xxxi. 15, 16, was grounded. For, I think, it can be satisfactorily shown, that the historical incident, Gen. xxxv. 16—19, whence the prophecy was evidently deduced, is itself a direct *type*, not of the event immediately referred to by Jeremiah, but of that to which St. Matthew applies the prophet's prediction; which prediction, in my apprehension, constitutes a middle term and a connecting link between the original historical type and the event in which the historical type found its literal fulfilment. I therefore consider the application by St. Matthew of Jer. xxxi. 15, to the murder of the Innocents, as an adjudgment which *authoritatively* establishes the connexion between the death-bed of Rachel (Gen. xxxv. 16—19.) and the massacre at Bethlehem (Matt. ii. 16.) as the *type* and *anti-type*."—pp. 32, 33.

The passage in Genesis, to which allusion is here made, is as follows:—

"And they (Jacob and his family) journeyed from Bethel; and there was but a little way to come to Ephrath; and Rachel travailed, and she had hard labour. And it came to pass, when she was in hard labour, that the midwife said unto her, Fear not, thou shalt have this son also. And it came to pass, as her soul was in departing, (for she died,) that she called his name Benoni (marginal reading, "the son of my sorrow,"): but his father called him Benjamin (marginal reading, "the son of the right hand,"). And Rachel died, and was buried in the way to Ephrath, which is Bethlehem."

And Mr. Forster's notion is—

"that Jeremiah diverted, from its proper object, to his immediate purpose, the prophetic type, Gen. xxxv. 16—19, in the way of *accommodation*; and that St. Matthew, by referring the prediction, Jer. xxxi. 15, to the massacre at Bethlehem, for its true fulfilment, has accomplished the final design of the Holy Spirit, in permitting the temporary discussion of the foregoing place of Genesis by the Prophet, viz., the authoritative re-union of this prophetic type with its real anti-type, through the medium

of a prophecy, couched in terms sufficiently affecting, to do justice to the deeply tragical event, to which it was meant, ultimately, to be applied."—p. 34.

In the establishment of this theory, Mr. Forster is, we think, less successful than in his refutation of P. Simon's hypothesis. As a specimen of ingenious criticism, the present Essay is not indeed inferior to the former; and its consideration would open a large field of various and not uninteresting discussion. But the length to which we have been carried in our notice of the Essay on Gen. xx. prevents our doing more in reference to that before us, than present its results to our readers, which we will do in the words, in which Mr. Forster himself "briefly recapitulates the heads of his analysis;" referring them to the book itself for the fuller development of his argument.

"1. BETHLEHEM is the scene of the historical type, Gen. xxxv. 16—19; but the scene, in its prophetical application, Jer. xxxi. 15—17, is laid in RAMAH. The *proximate* accomplishment of the prophecy, accordingly, took place at Ramah: but BETHLEHEM, and not RAMAH, is the scene of the *remote* fulfilment, both of the intermediate prophecy, and of the original historical type.

"2. The subject of the original type is, Rachel, at the point of death, weeping over *her infant son*. The subject of the intermediate prophecy is, Rachel weeping for her children, '*because they were not*.' In the *proximate* accomplishment of the prediction of Jeremiah, Rachel is only the emblem of Judea, weeping over her captive people, who were yet alive, of every sex and age. In the *remote* fulfilment of both type and prophecy, Rachel is the representative of the bereaved *mothers* of Bethlehem, weeping for *their slaughtered infant sons*.

"3. A principal incident of the historical type is, the death of Rachel. Rachel, in the history, dies, as it were, in place of her son Benjamin, in the vicinity of Bethlehem Ephrath. A principal incident of the intermediate prophecy answering to this, is the death of Rachel's children. Both incidents are without parallel, in the *proximate* accomplishment of the prediction, Jer. xxxi. 15—17. But, in the *remote* fulfilment of the prophecy, and of the prophetical type, a striking parallel to both incidents is presented; in the death of the Bethlehemitish male-children, whom Herod slew in the neighbourhood of that city; and who died, as it were, in the place of the infant Messiah, even as Rachel had died, in the stead of Benjamin her son.

"4. Another leading incident of the history is, the unexpected preservation, from a premature death, of the infant Benjamin. This incident is, in substance, preserved in the prophecy; but in the *proximate* application of the prophecy, it means no more than the preservation of the Jewish people, during the captivity. While, in the *remote* fulfilment, both of the type and the prophecy, it is literally accomplished, in the miraculous preservation, from a premature death, of the holy child, Jesus.

" 5. The son of Rachel was named, 1. ' Benoni,' or, ' the Son of my Sorrow ;' and, 2. ' Benjamin,' or, ' the Son of the Right Hand : ' he was, consequently, (the *general* typical of the two transactions being always understood,) a prophetic type of Him, who was hereafter to be born also in Bethlehem. For Christ was, 1. ' a man of Sorrow,' and, 2. ' the man of God's right hand ;' and, consequently, stands in the strict relation of anti-type to the Son of Rachel, whose two-fold name he bears. This remarkable coincidence, (which, so far as I can find, has escaped the commentators,) is peculiar to the original passage of Genesis, and the fulfilment in the Gospel.

" 6. In the history, Rachel, the mother of ' Benoni,' or, ' Benjamin,' the prophetic type of the Messiah, was conducted by her husband, Jacob, to the entrance of Bethlehem, on the eve of the birth of her Son. In the Gospel, Mary, the mother of Christ, the true anti-type of ' Benjamin,' or, ' Benoni,' was, in like manner, conducted to Bethlehem, by her husband Joseph, on the eve of the nativity of our Blessed Lord.

" 7. The promise to Rachel, in the prophecy of Jeremiah, is, ' they' (thy children) ' shall come again from the land of the enemy.' This promise, it is true, was, in part, fulfilled in a *proximate* accomplishment of the prediction, by the return of the children of the captivity, in the third generation, from *Babylon*. But, in the *remote* accomplishment of the prophecy of Jeremiah, the prophetic promise to Rachel was more literally, and far more transcendantly fulfilled, in the return of the child Jesus, the great anti-type of her son, Benjamin, from *the land of Egypt*.

" Lastly.—In the historical type, Rachel, when herself at the point of death, is encouraged ' not to fear,' by the consideration that her child, Benjamin, should live. In the intermediate prophecy, she is, in like manner, cheered in her last moments, by a similar assurance,— ' there is hope in mine end, saith the Lord, that thy children shall come free.' Which prophetic assurances could supply (to the Rachel of the Prophet especially) adequate grounds of consolation, only as pointing prospectively to the Advent, the miraculous preservation, and the coming again out of Egypt, of ' the Hope of Israel,' of ' Him who should be born in Bethlehem of Judea, King of the Jews."

It is impossible to shut our eyes to the felicity of many of the coincidences thus traced between the history of the birth of Benjamin, and that of our Lord's nativity. In the drawing out of the parallel, we easily recognise the same hand, which has elsewhere so ably illustrated the resemblance between Moses, and " that prophet like unto himself," of whom Moses spake.* But neither can we conceal from ourselves, that there are many circumstances, which, on a closer inspection, prevent our giving that full assent to Mr. Forster's hypothesis, to which, at first sight, it may seem entitled. Into the statement of these, however, we cannot now enter; they will probably suggest themselves to many, who,

* See " Discourses principally on Subjects of Scripture History, by the Reverend Charles Forster, B.D."

like ourselves, are far from looking with a friendly eye on that theory of accommodation, the application of which, in a particular instance, Mr. Forster's elucidation of the passage before us is intended to supersede. At the same time we are free to admit, that among those, whose minds revolt at the seeming difficulties of the literal interpretation of St. Matthew's language, the hypothesis of Mr. Forster will probably obtain a more favourable reception, than with those, whose judgments are in some degree affected by their comparative insensibility to those difficulties. To us it appears, (and the very attention we have given to Mr. Forster's Essay has only confirmed us in this view of the subject,) that it is far more difficult to reconcile what is called the proximate accomplishment of the prophecy with the words in which it is delivered, than to account for the introduction of the prophecy, where it stands, upon the supposition of its direct allusion to the event recorded by St. Matthew. In the explanation of that allusion we look, not to the intention of Jeremiah, to which alone the advocates of the theory of accommodation refer, and would confine us, but to the intention of the Holy Spirit, of which we conceive the declaration of St. Matthew to be an authoritative exposition; and which on this as on other occasions, we believe to have suggested the use of expressions, the full sense and scope of which was little apprehended by the prophets who uttered them. But we forbear, and in taking leave of our acute and learned Essayist, we have only to express our regret that, in travelling towards the same object, even the best friends will sometimes differ in the selection of the road.

ART. IV.—*Cæsar and God; a Sermon preached in the Parish Church of St. Martin, in Leicester, on Thursday, Sept. 21, 1826, before the Worshipful the Mayor and Corporation, previously to the Election of the Mayor for the Year ensuing.* By Edward Thomas Vaughan, M.A., Vicar of St. Martin's, Leicester, and Rector of Foston, Leicestershire. Leicester, T. Combe and Son. London, Baldwin and Co. 1826. pp. 68.

WHEN Dr. Sacheverell had astounded the Whiggish ears of the good citizens of London, by his well-known Fifth-of-November Sermon, Sir Samuel Garrard, the then Lord Mayor, whom Toland characterized, with much aptitude, as "a person of moderate wit, but a Tory in the highest degree," in an evil hour to himself, proposed to the assembled Court of Aldermen, that the obnoxious Discourse should be printed and the Preacher should be thanked, both at the expense of the Corporation. Never,

from the moment in which the Fallen Archangel encountered "a dismal universal hiss" when he anticipated "high applause," from the throats of his consulting Peers, were hopes more bitterly dashed. The motion was rejected with indignation, and the Preacher was reduced to—publish for himself.

But it was upon this very defeat that all Sacheverell's future fame (and no one ever had more in his generation) was established. He *did* publish for himself, *at the command* (as his Preface informs us) of the aforesaid Lord Mayor. A hot-headed and injudicious Impeachment followed; and the Kingdom was in a blaze, from Tweed-mouth to the Land's-End, in defence of the High-Church Champion. Broken windows and broken heads, mixed with all the other whims, humours, and fantasies, which distinguish an English mob, ensued in rapid succession. If the Queen set foot out of her Palace, her equipage was surrounded by an eager rabble, deafening the Royal ears with shouts of "God bless your Majesty! We hope your Majesty is for Dr. Sacheverell!" Chapels were assailed; Effigies of the odious Managers in the Commons were publicly committed to the flames; Dissenters were hooted through the streets like mad dogs; and the march of the condemned Doctor, through remote districts of the Island, was a perpetual triumph and a continued festivity. As a contemporary observed,

*Per Graiũm populos, mediasque per Elidis urbes
Ibat ovens, Divũmque sibi poscebat honores.*

But it is not every Preacher who meets with his deserts. Not all have the good fortune to find themselves summoned in person to answer at the Bar of the Honourable House of Commons, nor can boast of having their Sermons (however worthy of such distinction) burned by the hands of the Common Hangman. And this may arise, in part, from the more gentle and complying nature of our modern Bodies Corporate. The Worshipful the Mayor, the Mayor Elect, the Aldermen, the Common Councilmen, and the other Members of the Ancient and Loyal Borough of Leicester, are men of another guise from that which marked their London brethren, A.D. 1709. They have taken upon themselves earnestly to request Mr. Vaughan, to print and publish the "very able and excellent Sermon," now before us; and, not content with testifying their approbation through a barren *Inprimatur*, they have moreover drawn upon the Corporation Revenues to defray the charges of Foolscape and Hot-pressing.

Mr. Vaughan, as we believe, is well known in his immediate neighbourhood as a very Zealous Minister. He writes himself "Vicar of St. Martin's, Leicester, and Rector of Foston, Lei-

cestershire;" and hence we deduce (whatever misgivings might otherwise assail us) that he has sometime been ordained according to the rites of the Church of England, and therefore, that he has subscribed her Articles. His former publications are neither very bulky nor very numerous. The chief appear to be some Essays, entitled *The Truth*, Nos. I. II. III. IV. V. VI. VII. VIII. at 6d. each; and a tolerably thickish Octavo, *The Calvinistic Clergy defended, and the Doctrine of Calvin maintained*. But his *magnum opus*, and, as we doubt not, that upon which he mainly hopes to build his permanent Theological reputation, is this very laudable and Mayor-exhorting Discourse which he pronounced on the last Festival of St. Matthew.

Our task, in reviewing this Sermon, must be confined almost wholly to the display of passages; for in itself it admits neither of exposition nor of paraphrase, nor can it be elucidated by any commentary. *Magister Vaughan et sui amici sunt tales qui inquirunt secreta Scripturarum, quæ non possunt intelligi ab omnibus, nisi qui sunt illuminati a Domino*. He plunges, at one step, into the vast profound of his own peculiar Divinity; and those who are unable to ascertain, from himself, the precise meaning of his idiomatic language, must seek for it in vain elsewhere. How far we are among this number it is irrelevant to our present purpose to avow: thus much, however, we may unscrupulously state, that Mr. Vaughan has astonished us; that we regard him with unfeigned admiration; and that we consider his Intellect to spring from a hitherto unparalleled generation. It must have been begotten, unless we greatly mistake, by a cross between the pseudo-spiritualism of Swedenborg and the metaphysico-mystification of Kant.

From *Matthew*, xxii. 21. Mr. Vaughan first explains the circumstances under which the injunction was given of rendering to Cæsar and God their separate things. Our Lord, it seems, had "three distinct rencontres with the Pharisees;" He "cut his crafty venomous interrogators to the heart;" and He "sprang a countermine upon his antagonists" when they sought to entrap him in discourse. But as Mr. Vaughan uses his own translation of the Bible, in preference to the authorized version (a practice now and then of infinite convenience), it is but fair that we should put our readers in possession of the precise words upon which his reasoning is grounded: and this, indeed, is the more necessary, for otherwise there would be some occasions on which they might be somewhat at a loss in recognizing the Scriptures to which they are accustomed, under their new costume. "Then the Pharisees, having gone forth, consulted together how they may have entrapped him in discourse," (*ὅπως αὐτὸν παγιδεύσωσιν*), *Matt.* xxii. 15. "Having gone forth," we are told, "implies

that they left their own houses severally, and met together by concert and appointment." Now we think that Mr. Vaughan, notwithstanding his extensive Biblical labours, will be puzzled to find an authority for such a paraphrase of the very simple word *πορευθέντες*; which, in good truth, in this place, means no other than *having gone away or departed*; *sc.* from the presence of Jesus, who had before, as we are told, been addressing them. On the *past* sense, which Mr. Vaughan *invariably* affixes to the Aorists, all comment would be thrown away. He proceeds, "are we at liberty to have paid" (*δοῦναι*, to be in the habit of paying) "the Census to Cæsar." "Shall we have given or shall we not have given?" (*δῶμεν ἢ μὴ δῶμεν*. Matt. xxii. 17.)—"But Jesus having known *their maliciousness in this particular*," (*πονηρίαν*. "The very term which the sacred writers use to denote the Devil, the evil, or wicked, or *specially diseased*, or *painful*, or *mischievous one*,") answered them as in the Text.

"Thus their enterprize failed; they thought they held him enclosed as between the horns of a dilemma: if he should flee from Cæsar, he would spike himself upon the populace, whose favor was at present so formidable to them; if he fled from the people he would butt against Cæsar."—pp. 23, 24.

And hence arises the question, whether God has invested Cæsar with authority? That he has done so is proved by the following induction. God has accepted a substitute for the annihilation of his offending creatures; and it was his wisdom so to do for these plain reasons: because—

"the sustained devil is a witness for God's being, not only as His agent in temptation—a lying spirit in the mouth of His prophets, a bringer-out of latent evil in His chosen, and a hardener of His reprobates—but in his own personal condition; in his powerless powers and in his joyless enjoyments, in his wisdom turned to craft and his knowledge to misery. And how much more we, in our sustainment, who not only resemble the Devil, our chosen lord and master, in our perverted faculties, in our shame and in our wretchedness, but, through our peculiar constitution have afforded Him the opportunity of taking very union with the creature in its sin and ruin, and, by redintegration of it as the subject of sovereignly imposed distinctions, giving the last and irrefragable proof that He is and there is none beside Him. An end, which some may deem unmeaning, as not discerning that God, who delights in communicating of his good, cannot, till he has made his being, just such as it is known: a plan, which some may deem unnecessary, as not discerning that he who is inapprehensible to any sense, to every sense, and incomprehensible to any, to every finite, that is, every creature intellect, must by project and arrangement, and those of such a kind as to constrain the recognition, effect it. And what shall constrain this re-

cognition, but a project which precludes the possibility of supposing the first great cause of being to be inherent in the creature itself? And what shall preclude that possibility, but a scheme which unites curse with blessing, conservation with destruction, the ruin of the whole with the reproduction of the whole, resurrection of life and resurrection of damnation? Nor let it be overlooked, that, whilst our earth and those beings immediately connected with it are object large enough to call for such a demonstration of God's being—demonstration which shall compel the assent of the unbelieving despiser as well as confirm the faith of the satisfied expectant—our earth is but as a speck in the horizon to the system of the universe, and it may be that we are destined to teach the elements of the knowledge of God to other worlds as well as our own."—pp. 30—32.

"Now, if the dissolution of the twofold continuity of man, nay, of the whole creation as being connected with him, after having maintained it in its primary state for a while, together with its re-production after a while in a new form, unto a new kind of being and under new relations, amidst eternal arbitrary distinctions of shame and glory, bliss and misery, splendor and darkness, be in fact God's substitute for that annihilation which we have seen to be the sinning creature's due; if this whole substitution, commencing palpably with the Fall, but fixed and settled as that which should infallibly come out of it or ever a stone of the world was laid, had its basis in Christ only; in Christ, as able, and alone able, to sustain the edifice of a world saved from just and due annihilation by his making of himself part of it, and, as the fit recompence of his deed, receiving the entire dominion of it; if such be the moral condition of the governed creature, and such its relations to God, to Christ, and to its component elements; what becomes of all those man-exalting theories concerning the origin, nature and end of civil government, by which power is traced to the people as its source, submission made matter of choice and compact, and the governed the tribunal of the governor? As there is no power but of God, so is there no power of God but what is laid up in, derived from, and amenable for its exercise to, Christ only. As God is no anarchist, and man not only evil, but specially a rebel—an unwilling, discontented, turbulent subject—he must have the ruler's eye upon him continually. As he believes not what he sees not, that eye must be a visible one: even the Jews, with God's king avowedly at their head, and set out to them as bearing that office in all their ordinances, called for a king, as though they had not one; because they saw not one. As the re-produced Head cannot, either in his predestinated or realized elevation, be of the same form with the as yet undissolved material of the world which he has earned and received, and cannot therefore be visible, or in any wise sensible to sensible substances; as his life must be different, his presence reserved, his communications select; he must exercise his headship by a Vicegerent. There must be a Cæsar, in short, a sensible head of rule, in the person of either one or many. *Necessary* government implies *restraint and imposition*, not indulgence and flattery, as its characteristic properties. The Universal King must universally be the

ultimate object of rule and justice, that all may know, own, and serve Him. Here is seen the just and unalienable alliance between the Church and the State; ridiculed, as it is, by the profane, perverted by the selfish. The State exists for the Church; the Church overshadows the State. If Cæsar loll on his throne because he has Christ for its supporter, he forsakes his office; but that throne has no other real support than the unseen Rock, and the unseen Rock has its aptest and most efficacious witness in the visible throne which throws back all its glory and honor upon Him."—pp. 33—36.

Upon these grounds, although Mr. Vaughan rejoices in his heart that the land of his nativity is the seat of a limited monarchy, although he is delighted in the possession of *Magna Charta*, and thanks God for the securities of the bloodless Revolution, yet he "could not have fought at Runnymede," where there never was any battle; and he "must have hesitated to take a seat in the Convention Parliament," into which he was not eligible.

Far beyond that most obsequious Prelate, who, as it is recorded, assured James I. that he might take all the money of his subjects, since he was the breath of their nostrils, Mr. Vaughan contends that to *take* it is not by any means necessary, for that it already belongs to the King; not only as once levied in benevolences and subsidies, or, according to the more modern practices, in customs, assessed taxes, and stamp duties, but at the very moment in which the bullion is transferred from the coffers of the Bank in Lothbury to the Presses of the Mint on Tower Hill.

"When you see your King's head upon a crown piece, surmounted with his style, what does this declare to you? What, but that the current coin, every sovereign and every penny, is truly and properly his? Why, is it not his if it derives all its value from him? I cannot give value to that which is not mine, and it is plain the King's head gives its value to that paltry substance which has worth to procure all the necessities of life for me. What is it without his stamp; and what right has he to stamp it? Evidently, his right is his supremacy, his power of saying, I will; and where that power is exerted, it is manifested to be. All the currency of the kingdom, then, is the King's, and if you or I possess a shilling, it is because the King has given it us; and if we possess a piece of paper, whether from the Government bank, or from a private company, which fetches something, it is because the King has given the issuers leave to use their credit. Then, if Cæsar calls for tribute, he calls for that which has been his, and which he has given to me, but given with the understanding that when he wanted it he should have it again. It matters not, you perceive, whether it be the denarius, or a piece of paper, or a bale of goods, in which the tribute is paid; the worth of each resolves itself into Cæsar's word. He condescends to receive the paper, or the goods, as the substitute for that which tells his right to it. Well might Jesus say, "Give back."—pp. 40, 41.

According to this principle, not only his Majesty and the Duke

of Wellington among living men, but the Marquess of Granby and the King of Prussia among the defunct, the Turk and Saracen among the unbelievers, and, in the wide circle of equivocal generation, Blue Lions and Green Dragons, Spread Eagles, Swans with two necks, *et hoc genus omne*, each in himself is undoubted sole proprietor of his own respective head, whenever he chances to meet with it emblazoned on a sign post.

Next for the rendering to God.

“ It is the fashion to suppose that all men, promiscuously and without exception, have whereof to render; and that their offerings, even without the intermediation of any other substance of their own, if sincere, as they term it, cannot fail to gain admission. But this is not true: the considerations which we have already entertained (p. 28 to 33.) evince that it is not. If every human being is born under a deserved curse of annihilation, which is commuted for dissolution with reproduction into a various state, some to shame and some to glory, is it possible that the dissolved, or waiting-to-be-dissolved substance *through* curse and *in* curse, can have any thing to offer; or that any thing which he hath can be offered with acceptance? Why, then, the non-entity exists; or, more correctly, the scattered, whose elements have been separated far as earth from hell, as pole from pole, remains one substance: nay, whom God hath spoken ill to, unto the severment of their constituent parts, He still counts worthy.

“ I do not charge false teachers and false worshippers with the full monstrosity of their doctrine: it is hidden from them. If they really saw, could they go on thus to contradict and insult God? Virtually He has dissolved even now, because he could do no less, the substance which hath denied His being; and this substance comes before Him as though it had done nothing amiss: for to talk of amissness to God which is not followed by destruction is to make him such an one as ourselves, who may offend each other and shake hands—or one of the parties *say*, I am very sorry—and they are as good friends as ever. God is not so mocked; *his* injuries of every kind and degree are a conflict *ad internectionem*—to the extermination of the offenders. The truth, meanwhile, that God has found a way in which his dissolved ones for whom he has prepared a blessed reproduction may stand up in his presence as reproduced before the time. Not only has he by predestination conformed them to the image, that is, to the outside, or visible part, the body, of his Son before all worlds, and, as so conformed, received them into the number of his true, accepted, eternal servants and worshippers, but He has also devised instruments varied some little in appearance, but always essentially the same, by which to put his foreknown, elect and predestinated ones into an *as it were* present possession of the benefit; thus enabling them, even in the days of their flesh, and, whilst yet waiting for their dissolution, ‘to present their bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, as their reasonable service.’ (Rom. xii. 1.)”
—pp. 46—48.

“ But this hindereth not that the truly reproduced man, he in whom

the Spirit of the reproduction, say rather, in whom Christ, by and in the person of that Spirit, is, do enter into the bliss and power and glory of that state. Every such person, whether it be in the article of Baptism, or before, or long afterwards, that he have received the gift of the person of the Holy Ghost to dwell and walk in him, is taught to ascribe his gift to that ordinance, and to deal with himself, and with all other substances, as though he were *completely* reproduced (being really so *in part*) into the new creation state, as one of its Kings and Priests in Christ Jesus. (Revel. i. 6.) This is what I venture to characterize as the state of "realized baptism," an *as it were* resurrection whilst we are yet in the body."—pp. 49, 50.

One only point now remains untouched: namely, to show the connection between rendering to Cæsar and to God: and in this there is but little difficulty; for the power of the one is manifestly derived from that of the other. Scripture on very many occasions exhibits this connection.

"Peter's advice to the elect dispersion strangers is, 'Have been subjected, therefore, to every human creation (or, *constitution*) on account of the Lord; whether to the King, as super-eminent, or to leaders, as being in sending by him to the taking of vengeance upon evil-doers, and to the praise of good doers. For this is God's will, that by doing good we make dumb the ignorance of senseless men. As being free men, yet not having this liberty as the covering of our wickedness, but as being the servants of God. Be about to show respect to all men. Love the community of the Brotherhood. Fear God. Show respect to the King.' (1 Pet. ii. 13—17.) His fore-announcement concerning the wrath to come is, that, as 'the Lord knoweth how to reserve the unjust until the day of judgment, that they may be punished, *so especially he knows how to reserve* those who walk behind the flesh in pollution lust (*lust which pollutes it*), and who despise lordship. Daring persons, pleasers of self, they do not tremble at blaspheming glories (*persons of distinction*).' (2 Pet. ii. 9, 10.) Jude describes the same objects of judgment; 'In like manner, truly, these also in their dreaming pollute the flesh on the one hand, and on the other make a nothing of lordship, and, farther, blaspheme (*rail at*) glories.' (Jude 8.) Paul, moreover, the prince of the witnesses on this subject, who apologizes for having given a disrespectful name to God's High Priest, when under arraignment before the council, (see p. 57.) commands thus: 'Let every soul rank itself under the super-eminent authorities. For there is not an authority except from God; but the existing authorities have been ordained by God. So that he who sets himself in array against the authority, hath stood out against the distributive arrangement of God. But they who stand out shall receive condemnation to themselves. For the rulers are not a dread to the works which are good, but to the works which are evil. But art thou willing not to dread authority? Do what is good, and thou shalt have praise from it. For he is a God minister, to thee unto what is good. But if thou doest that which is evil, dread. For he doth not carry the sword idly. For he is a God minister, an

avenger, unto wrath to him that doeth what is evil. Wherefore there is a necessity for you to subject yourself, not only on account of the wrath (*which is impending,*) but also on account of your conscience. For on this account ye even pay tribute. For they are God's office-bearers, acting strength in their office unto this very thing. Give back therefore to all men their dues: to him who hath the due of tribute (*tax from produce*), tribute; to him who hath the due of custom (*tax upon exports and imports*), custom; to whom dread, dread; to whom respect, respect."—pp. 59—61.

In the last proof upon which Mr. Vaughan relies we do not altogether coincide with him. But, perhaps, as he uses a private version of the Bible, he may also employ a *corrected* Edition of the Liturgy.

"The Occasional Offices distinctly recognize the election, ordination, institution and unction of the sovereign by God himself, his right to the hearts of his people, and his sons' and sons' sons' rights after him, in the order of primogeniture. The appropriations made in that for the Martyrdom are hyberbolical in the extreme, if Charles were not the Vicegerent and Representative of Jesus. How else can the murder at Whitehall be deplored as a repetition of the treason acted on Mount Calvary, and the phrenzy with which England embrued her hands with the blood of a mere human monarch be made the parallel of that infatuation to which the Jews were given up as the fruit and summit of the great and long provocations of their sins?"—pp. 62, 63.

In our copies, the Occasional Office for the 30th of January no where deplores the murder of Charles I. "as a repetition of the Treason acted on Mount Calvary." It does indeed (and most truly) represent the pious King as "following the steps of his blessed Master and Saviour," in the meek endurance of barbarous indignities, and of praying for his murderers, "according to the same pattern." But in this very natural, very just, and very Scriptural language, we see nothing of that unseemly and irreverent approximation of the Martyr to his Redeemer which has been the coinage of Mr. Vaughan's fancy. Has he forgotten that most extraordinary coincidence by which the Second Lesson for the day, read by Bishop Juxon to the King, but a few hours before he ascended the Scaffold, contained in it the narrative of our Saviour's Crucifixion, as related in *Matt.* xxvii.?

Mr. Vaughan's powers of ratiocination have been amply exhibited above; a single specimen of his sublimity must suffice in conclusion.

"Now, therefore, what remains but that I solemnly commend this subject to your most serious attention? In addressing the Mayor and Corporation of this ancient and loyal Borough as a preparation for the annual election of their Chief Magistrate, I do a work of Cæsar and of

God. Cæsar must have his subordinates, even as God has his Cæsar. There are many magistracies, but one Magistrate; he who wears the crown the chief of the visible, but the hidden sceptre-bearer God's delegated Chief of All. What subject, then, so suitable to the occasion, as that which gives origin to the occasion; God's transfer of his power to the second Person of his substance, made empty, made a creature: who being unseen must be represented by seen ones: to whom therefore, by his Constitutor's will, he transmits a portion of his authority; to Cæsar variously divided; to you, my honored Sirs, as well as to the King. What better preparation for the exercise of your authority, than to be reminded whence it comes, and how and why?—May God bless you in revolving these things! Know, my friends, that no part of His truth standeth alone; no part is intelligible alone; to know any thing you must know all things; to know Cæsar you must know Christ. It is my fervent hope that both you, and others through you, will be led into that searching of the Scriptures to know for yourselves 'the things of Cæsar' which shall issue in you obtaining a spiritual understanding of 'the things of God;' the things which make God known; which He revealeth to whom He will by his Spirit; which are foolishness to the natural man, but to him that is taught of God, wisdom and peace!

"What a proof we have of man's native stolidity and stubbornness in the insensibility with which he overlooks and spurns his teachers! I speak not of oral, or of written teachers—whose cry and claim to be heard is more impetuous, and the impending vengeance of their neglect, therefore, still more tremendous—but of the speaking signs with which God surrounds him. Who, almost, sees God in the small mite of the sun-beam, hears Him in the soft zephyr, magnifies Him in the stupendous frame of his own body, and cries out for Him, as needed to satisfy them, in the consciousness of the capacities of his soul? Even the pomp and pageant of Cæsar is affecting: how much more his wrath, which is as the roaring of a lion; his voice when it inflicts death! Yet does any stop to inquire, whilst the procession passes by, Whence came those lictors with the fasces? By what authority doth man judge man? Who gave to one who is no more than my fellow in nature that robe which adorns, and that sword which makes him terrible? If these questions were humbly and solicitously asked, there would in no long time come a voice from the excellent glory, 'This is my beloved Son, hear him. The pageant which thou sawest is the emblem of a state not yet formed, of a throne not yet disclosed; the manifestation moreover, and a part of the agency, of an empire which is even now maintaining itself, and which hath conducted all things from the beginning: whose seat is the right hand of God, and whose head is the Lord of glory—He that hath come and shall come again.' Then who am I, will the trembling inquirer say, that I should abide the day of his coming? that I should stand when he appeareth? 'Thou doest well to tremble. Such trembling is the paroxysm which prepareth the frame for peace; encourage it by acquainting thyself better with thine own self, thy origin, thy woes, thy heart. And when thou hast lien prostrate for a while, self-emptied,

self-despairing, I will acquaint thee with my Jesus; thou shalt know him, thou shalt believe in him; thou shalt know him, thou shalt love him; and not him only but Me *out of* whom he came, and *from* whom he came, and *to* whom he hath returned; Whose he is, and Whom he serveth, and Whom thou shalt know, and confess, and serve with him: I AM speaketh to thee.' "—pp. 65—67.

If this be not fine writing where is fine writing to be found? *aut hic aut nusquam est*. Such an union of the sonorous and the substantial, of the glowing and the grave, of rotundity of mouth and profundity of bottom, is not of frequent occurrence. It would be well worth a journey to Leicester to be present at a similar delivery; and if this be the vein in which Mr. Vaughan appeals to the ears of the groundlings and the gallery-sitters, as often as he mounts the pulpit, we cannot wish too fervently—

That when he next doth preach again,
We may be there to hear!

ART. V.—*Sermons, chiefly designed to display the Connection between a sound Faith and a holy Life*. By the Rev. Edward Patteson, M.A. of East Sheen, Surrey; formerly of Trinity College, Oxford. London, Rivingtons. 1826. 1 vol. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

ADDISON, has somewhere remarked, that "good writing does not consist in saying what is new, but in saying what is already known, in a new and agreeable manner." This observation, true in every case, is especially just with respect to divinity, in which there is no important truth that is not ancient, and whatever is really new is certainly false. A preacher of the Gospel, therefore, must relinquish every attempt to engage the attention of his auditors by the novelty of his subject; he must constantly propound the same doctrines, inculcate the same precepts, and urge the same motives. And it will inevitably happen that these topics, notwithstanding their tremendous importance, will, by their constant recurrence, return with less and less interest: this is a great disadvantage, and it is a disadvantage with which the ministers of Christianity will, for the reasons we have just given, find it more difficult to contend than any other persons whose office it is to speak frequently in public. They who plead at the bar, they who harangue in the senate, have it always in their power, from the very nature of their subjects, to secure the attention, by gratifying the curiosity, of their hearers; because their efforts are seldom excited upon things which by their constant use are brought

into a stale and unaffecting familiarity; some degree of novelty must be one of the materials in every instrument which is designed to work upon the human mind, for curiosity blends itself more or less with all our passions. This difficulty is felt by the clergy, some of whom, in their endeavours to diminish or overcome it, have adopted a style little suited to the gravity of their character, or to the dignity of their subject; a style at once flippant, turgid, and declamatory, which strives to conceal the poverty of meaning with the tinsel finery of verbiage. We have long thought that a florid sermon is the least difficult of all literary compositions, while a plain and unadorned discourse, which has the power to arrest the attention of the hearers, is the production of a sound judgment and extensive information.

We are happy to have it in our power to confirm and illustrate this opinion by the excellent collection of sermons which are now before us. The purity and elegance of the style, the closeness and accuracy of the reasoning, the clearness of arrangement, the soundness of doctrine, and, above all the rest, the vein of genuine, unaffected, and glowing piety, which runs through the whole volume, give it a claim to general attention.

The collection consists of twenty sermons; the leading object of which, as the title indicates, is to display the connection between a sound faith and a holy life.

The first sermon is "on the Inefficacy of Nominal Religion." In this discourse the learned writer expatiates with considerable ability on Jer. viii. 22. "Is there no balm in Gilead; is there no physician there? why then is not the health of the daughter of my people recovered?" The next, which is equally excellent, is "on the Testimony of Conscience," from these words, "If our heart condemn us, God is greater than our heart, and knoweth all things. If our heart condemn us not, then have we confidence towards God."—1 John, iii. 20, 21. The third sermon is a very superior composition: it is "on Self-Examination," from Psalm iv. 4. "Commune with your own heart, and in your chamber, and be still." If our space permitted, we would gladly transcribe some passages from this sermon, which indicate the skilful anatomist of the human heart; we give the following as a specimen of our author's style:—

"If there is any particular head of duty on which we reflect with reluctance, and from which we find ourselves repeatedly shrinking with aversion; this is but too manifest a sign that we have some favourite vices or follies which we cannot bear to look into;—some tender point in our character which we are afraid to probe. No other monition then can we require—none stronger could we receive—that this is the point, of

all others, to be investigated with the most unsparing rigour. Neither is it only what we may have actually done or said that we are bound to consider; but on what motives we have acted and spoken: for, though it is the outward act that affects our fellow-mortals, it is the intention that marks its character in the sight of God, and by which, therefore, our own judgement of it must be decided, and hence appears, in the strongest light, the necessity of subjecting thoughts, as well as deeds and words, to the scrutiny of conscience."

In the fourth sermon, (for Good Friday,) "on the Divinity of Christ," from Philippi. ii. 5. we have an instance of the literary excellence alluded to above, which consists in giving a well known subject a new and interesting aspect, by the judicious manner in which it is discussed. But as this effect can only be perceived by viewing the whole composition, we cannot convey to our readers an adequate idea of the merits of the Discourse by any brief extracts, to which our narrow limits compel us to confine ourselves.

The next sermon "on the Limits of Conformity," is an able exposition and amplification of 1 Cor. ix. 22. "I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some." The following objection is strongly stated, and triumphantly confuted:

"'And this,' remarks the infidel, 'is the confession of an Apostle: these, if we may credit his own account, were the means by which his opinions were to be propagated, and his party strengthened, and this is the pattern which he holds out for imitation!' A most serious imputation, indeed, would this be, were there a particle of truth in it. But St. Paul, my brethren, you may safely believe and insist had no ends to be so gained. He neither professed nor recommended such detestable duplicity: nor would he have sanctioned the use of such means were the ends in view ever so laudable. The charge, in fact, like every similar charge against the first preachers of the Gospel, bears intrinsic marks of improbability. They who lie in wait to catch men for evil purposes do not usually make a display of the traps which they employ. What the Apostle here means by 'saving some,' is evidently—saving their souls from everlasting perdition, by turning them from sin to righteousness: and the methods, be assured, of which he proposed to avail himself for this truly benevolent and glorious end, could not involve the sacrifice of honour and truth. To his purpose it was essential, that he should maintain the moral dignity of his own character; and he could not but be aware, that had he set about the conversion of sinners, by flattering their follies and conforming to their vices, he would only have convinced them that he was no better than themselves. So far did he actually become 'all things to all men,' that having to do of necessity with men of various descriptions, Jews and Gentiles, nobles and plebeians, learned and illiterate, philosophers and rustics; men of lively imaginations, but defective judgement, and men of weak minds, but strong prejudices, he

thought fit to enter freely into their several notions and conceptions of things; to talk to them (if I may so express it) in their own way, and reason with them upon their own principles: and so, partly by refuting their errors upon admitted grounds; partly by giving way to harmless prepossessions; and partly by setting before them the advantages and the beauties of the Christian system, in such points of view as were best suited to their habits and capacities, to invite and guide them into the kingdom of Heaven—that is—into a cordial acceptance of the Gospel-covenant. This, in St. Paul's acceptance of the words, was 'becoming all things to all men,' that he 'might by all means save some.'

"Would to God we could now see, not only such persons as apparently devote their lives to the business of conversion, and seem to compute the value of their labours by the number of their proselytes, but even those who burn with a purer zeal for the honour of God and the advancement of religion, proceeding half so judiciously as this most ardent and zealous Apostle!"—pp.90—94.

The tenth sermon is on "the Mystery of the Holy Trinity," John, iii. 9. "Nicodemus answered and said unto him, how can these things be?" In this Discourse we find good practical inferences from this important doctrine; and we strongly recommend it to the perusal of such of our readers as desire to see how fully even the deepest mysteries of our holy faith are calculated to minister to the spiritual consolation of the humblest believer.

The eleventh sermon "on the Character of Abraham," Genesis, xxii. 6. is an instructive dissertation on a most affecting subject; and here the skill and judgment of the writer are eminently conspicuous.

In the thirteenth sermon, "The Portrait of Charity," 1 Cor. xiii. 8. we find an interpretation of 1 Peter, iv. 8. to which we cannot assent: in this the author has fallen into the error, countenanced, we admit, by many respectable authorities, that the apostle alludes to the concealment of *our own* sins; but, we submit that this exposition is not only contrary to the analogy of faith, but to the scope of the apostle's argument. No works or dispositions of ours can atone for our transgressions, and this no one knows better, or asserts more strongly, than Mr. Patteson himself; besides, the context will not admit of this interpretation. They are the sins of *others* that charity conceals; that is, conceals from the world. Assuredly, no sincere Christian will close his eyes to the sins of his neighbour, neither will it be charity in him to do so, when he considers how hateful in the sight of God all sin must be: but while he sees the sins of his neighbour, he will strive to reclaim him, and he will do this in such a way that *the world shall not know them*: this is real charity, and this is the charity which hideth the multitude of sins.

Here we shall conclude our remarks upon these Discourses.

To students in theology we recommend them as specimens of elegant composition, in which the important doctrines of the Gospel are strongly asserted and warmly and zealously enforced, and they will find in them an additional proof of what they cannot too frequently call to mind, that the only root from which a correct and impressive style of composition in divinity can spring, is a deep, extensive, and accurate knowledge of the Holy Scriptures.

ART. V. — *Reise in die Gegend zwischen Alexandrien und Parätonium, die Libysche Wüste, Siwa, Egypten, Palästina, und Syrien, in den Jahren 1820 und 1821.* Von Dr. Joh. Mart. Augustin Scholz, Professor der Theologie auf der Universität zu Bonn. Leipsic. 1822. 8vo.

THE name of Dr. Scholz has long been well known to biblical scholars, although his works have not passed beyond the German language: his *Biblical Tour* and the present work, on account of its connexion with theological inquiries, rank deservedly among the most important discoveries of modern times. We consider it consistent with our plan to attract the public notice to his labours, as we shall shortly have to devote our attention to a New Testament by this author, in which a new system of recensions and various readings, unknown to Griesbach and Matthæi, are brought to light, by means of his unwearied researches in various countries of Europe and the East.

The present series of *Travels* was undertaken under imperial auspices: Dr. Scholz sailed from Trieste to Alexandria in the month of August, 1820, making observations on manners, customs and languages, at the different places at which he touched on the voyage. He does not immediately enter into minutæ, but after enumerating his predecessors who had written on these regions, and describing the dangers to which caravans are exposed from the Bedúins, he contents himself with giving a synopsis of his travels in the first part of the book, which he amplifies and carries into detail in the sequel. The most important part in this division of his work is the table of distances, which he has given.

After the first excursion which he made from Alexandria, and his return thither, sickness prevailed among his companions, and Professor Lieman, of Berlin, died there. On the recovery of the others, he proceeded by the new canal to *Fum'el makmudyè*; and, in company with one Italian and some Arabian merchants in three days reached Cairo in a hired vessel. Being dissuaded

from immediately visiting Nubia and Abyssinia, he was advised by the Bishop of Babylon to accompany him to Palæstine and Syria. Although he was the Roman-Catholic Bishop of all Chaldæa and Assyria, and although his diocese was very extensive, the number of Christians of his persuasion did not exceed *three thousand*.

But “the very numerous Catholics of the Chaldæan Church have their patriarchs and bishops,—those of the Syrian and Armenian churches, as well as the Maronites, have, likewise, their own bishops.”

At Cairo he employed himself in examining the most remarkable things in the city and its environs, particularly the pyramids. At *Bilbeish* he and his companions were joined by some Englishmen; and at *Saalhigeh* by five Coptic, eight Syrian, thirteen Palæstinian, and five Curdish merchants, with twelve negro-slaves, and one Indian Dervish, with an attendant, who had sold all his property, which was very considerable, in his native land, for the sake of making the pilgrimages to Mecca and Jerusalem. This devotee, for the space of four years, had migrated from place to place, and all his property having been stolen from him at Mecca, had since subsisted upon alms. In addition to these, they were joined by several travellers from *Bilbeish* and *Gaza*, so that the caravan consisted of more than 80 people, 140 camels, 1 dromedary, 30 asses, and 1 horse. During the course of this journey, the author describes the various modes of travelling adopted by these different nations, their peculiar customs, and religious duties, which we shall omit, since other writers have already treated of them most circumstantially. Having arrived at Jerusalem, he made excursions on the coast as far as *Kesserwan*; from thence he penetrated into the interior of Palæstine, and returned to Jerusalem at Easter. At first he had intended to have directed his course to *Shàm*; but, on account of the unfavourable aspect of affairs, he hastened to *Jaffa*, where he found the political consternation still greater. Two letters conclude this chapter, from which we learn, that he accompanied the Bishop of Babylon from Jerusalem to *Akka*, and explored the plains of *Saronu*, *Cæsarea*, *Tautora* and *Atlid*,—that he visited Carmel and the whole of Galilee, *Saida*, *Beirut*, *Samaria*, *Richa*, the *Dead Sea*, *Mount Karantan*, *Saba*, *Bethany*, and other memorable places in Judæa, the knowledge of which will be found important, when it shall become our task to criticise the new readings of his Testament and their sources. But the general commotion prevented him from proceeding through Samaria and Decapolis to *Shàm* and Lebanon.

From hence he animadverts on the mode and danger of travel-

ling in the East, on the impositions which are continually practised, and the expenses actually requisite to the performance of the several distances. Like many others, he observes that

“ rich Englishmen have very much injured other travellers. They arrived in these regions with some thousand pounds sterling, and he who cannot now command as much, is pitied, as a *poor devil*, and scarcely considered to be worthy of attention. The Sheikhs of the country are upbraided for countenancing these impositions, yet unjustly, for the devotees in the cloisters possess an impertinence as rarely equalled. I have observed them waiting a whole day before the door of a traveller, for a large *Bakhshish*, because they had drawn his attention to some festival in the church. The Armenian and Greek monks have a refined manner of indemnifying themselves for their services. They never omit giving to the foreigner one of their creatures, as a guide, who quickly gains his confidence, and acquaints him with the tax, which they account charity, conferred as alms upon the church. If the individual be rich, this tax among the Armenians often amounts to 1000 piastres for a few dinners and nights' lodgings. The Greeks ask for little, but they ask so much the more frequently in proportion. Yet the poor pilgrim receives humane treatment from them.

“ In the cultivated part of Syria they travel most comfortably on mules. They carry great burdens, and run much quicker than camels. The latter are, in general, but ill adapted to the rocky mountains of Judæa. They have no firm footing, and often lie down with their load. On the coast as far as Lèbanon, and in Galilee, one is secure from the attacks of robbers; but, in the other parts of Syria, the journey is always full of danger. Three years since a caravan, going from Shàm to Baghdàd, consisting of more than 100 camels, was totally plundered and murdered. Those from Shàm to Haleb are frequently surprized. The journey to Tadmor has been most perilous for a Frank, since the Bedùins of the territory were chastised by an army of the sultan for the murder of an English traveller of rank. The Nomades conceive themselves justified in these atrocities, either when they find any one in the caravan, on whom they can exercise the law of retribution (*jus talionis*) or blood wages, or when they have not agreed beforehand with them as to the payment, for which, (indeed, as for everything,) they resolve to lay actual claims on their own ground and soil. And this they often do from love of murder and rapine.”

Dr. Scholz left Jaffa in an Austrian polacca, nearly filled with Russian pilgrims, bound by Cyprus to Constantinople. Having been prevented from landing at Cyprus by a storm, the vessel was driven to Rhodes. Here they experienced the results of the war between the Turks and the Greeks; for, although they indeed received food and wine at Rhodes, they were cautioned against visiting the city, because throughout the Ottoman dominions Christians were liable, at this juncture, to be put to death by the

Turks and Jews. Going from one place to another, hearing everywhere contradictory accounts of the war, they found each in an absolute state of perturbation. A lively description of this universal sensation, in each part of Greece which the author visited, is subjoined, in which he has disclosed an extensive acquaintance with the politics and operations of the conflicting powers. From hence he took ship to Trieste.

Having in this synopsis described his travels by means of this singular arrangement, he now enters into particulars. We must consequently retrace his steps to the region between Alexandria and the frontiers of the Tripolitan territory, of which he has given an ample topography, carefully writing the name of each place in the Arabic character, and measuring the distances by hours. In this catalogue of places he has recorded the springs and *manzils*, and detailed the names of spots not visited by him on the authority of the Bedúins. To a future traveller in these regions this information will be invaluable, and from the difficulty of ascertaining Oriental words written in our character, his attention to their Arabic orthography may, hereafter, prove of incalculable utility.

The following chapter is devoted to the natural history of the places.

“To the distance of one-eighth or one-fourth of an hour from the sea, the soil is either sandy or stony, from thence to the distance of ten or eighteen hours inland, it is clay, with very little sand or stone. In only a small part of it barley is sown in December. They turn up the light soil once with the camel, by means of a small plough, throw the seed on the earth, and harrow it into it. After three months they pluck off the ears, and immediately thresh out the corn on the field.”

In this region there are very few trees : palms, pomegranates and figs alone are noticed. Among the insects, ants, flies, dragonflies, varieties of the beetle and moths (particularly the *scarabæus sacer*) in great abundance, and innumerable snails were observed : coralline fragments, also, shells, spiral shells and fungus, seen on the shores, of various sizes, forms and colours, attested the vast population of the sea. Different species of green lizards, adders and snakes,—birds of prey, such as eagles, vultures, owls,—aquatic fowls, singing birds, and a vast number of Ubaras every where abounded. The Bedúins understand the art of training a species of vulture or hawk, called *saker*, to fowling. They tame him by hunger, and, holding him over a flame of fire, hood him with a leathern cap, which they extend round the bill, so that he may be able to eat, while at the time of fowling, they contract the cap at pleasure, to prevent him from destroying the prey. At first they throw small birds before him, and by degrees dispatch him after every bird flying in his sight, and not only after birds, but

after hares and gazelles. They carry him on the hand, securing one foot with a string, and letting him fly where these animals are found; he generally kills them, without lacerating them. The value of such a trained bird is about fifty Spanish piastres. Rats, hares, antelopes, foxes and wolves, are very common; and the ordinary domestic animals are the camel, the sheep, the goat, the ass, the horse, the cow, and the dog. The Bedúins here mix pounded date and honey with their butter, and lead a primitive life. The plants are but few, and are cited according to their Arabic names.

The next chapter, which relates to the remains of the former occupants of these districts, is very interesting. Granite and marble pillars, walls and tumuli, attest the immense population which once filled the immense tract from Alexandria to Murabut. The remains of the celebrated Baths of Cleopatra give but a faint idea of their ancient splendour; a far better idea of the magnificence of these ancient structures may be formed from the catacombs, which extend in all directions for nearly half a mile, near to which may be found other sepulchres hewn in the limestone. At Murabut there are vestiges of a powerful city near the sea, which extend to a very considerable distance under water. Other ruins were visible in this vicinity; among which those of the city Abusir are the most remarkable. Ancient characters, of which a specimen is given, were observed on one of its walls. Formerly a temple of Osiris stood here, from whom the name BUSIR or ABUSIR appears to be derived. The author is inclined to assign three dates to the ruins between Abusir and Agaba:—the first he attributes to the times of the Ptolemies or Romans, the second to the Saracens, and the third to the more modern Arabs, which tripartite classification he substantiates from the internal evidences.

He has subjoined plans of several of these ruins, on the walls of some of which he discovered Hebrew and Greek inscriptions of modern date; on the plains tombs of many saints were seen, but more particularly on the eminences. On the stones of a monument near *Sterrir* he noticed strange characters, which appear to us to have some affinity to the cabalistical alphabets of the Arabs, of which Hammez has given specimens. But the characters seem mostly to have been of Egyptian origin, and we clearly retrace the admixture of two Arabic and one Hebrew letter; probably they were some species of *ἐγχώγια γράμματα*. There is one continued succession of antiquities from Alexandria and Damanhur to Agaba, scarcely hitherto explored; and the remains of cities and villages are so numerous, that many important discoveries might be elicited from a careful examination of them. Although Dr. Scholz does not appear to have been

careless in his researches, he seems not to have been sufficiently versed in the ancient history and local traditions of these parts, to apply their aid to the elucidation of these monumental phenomena. The records of the Arabs, and the legends of the roving tribes, could not have been totally destitute of information; for instance, would not the retentive memory and highly-wrought mind of the Bedúin, from long habits preserving the history and fables of his race, have furnished some data concerning the small Arabian city lying in desolation at *Wadi-Tanum*? would not some account also of the various harbours, which he has mentioned, have survived for a considerable period after their ruin?

At three hours distance from Agaba, remains of houses buried in the sands were noticed, which he conceives to correspond with the ancient Parætonium. He is of opinion, that

“before the period commemorated in history, the Libyans may have inhabited these fertile districts near the sea, and that they possessed the most intimate connexion with the inhabitants of the Oasis of Jupiter Ammon, or that those people may have inhabited it in part, whose descendants, *INACHUS*, *PHORONEUS*, *CECROPS*, and *DANAUS*, made the Greeks acquainted with Jupiter Ammon, whom we find in great honour among them. . . . Perhaps, also, near the sea and on the main road above Parætonium in the Pentapolis, in the latter times of the Persians and of the Ptolemies, vast nations may have resided, into which idea some of the ruins already described lead us. Probably, they were the Bashmuriens, who from their wild predatory spirit extended themselves from hence to the Delta. The tradition current among the Copts on this subject is favourable to this hypothesis.”

The succeeding chapter describes the present inhabitants of this territory. They are Beduins, who

“dwell in camps, (the situation of which they change from time to time,) under dark tents composed of hair-mats, to the number of two to three hundred families together. Each family has, according to the extent of its power, one or more tents, which are very spacious, though low, and fixed in several rows. The women scarcely ever dwell alone, but all the day form a circle for themselves, without intruding into that of the men. The head of each encampment (حېش) is a Sheikh, but these are rather co-ordinate than subordinate to those of the horde, to which they belong. The most powerful tribes of this region are the Waled' Ali, (ولد علي) the Jimiyat, (جيمية) and the Gharbi (غربي). Formerly, they were independent,” &c.

We cannot here enter into the copious detail, which he has given, of their power and condition, of the peculiar customs of their men and women, of their mode of traffic, and of the nature of their excursions. Their ordinary food is

“peas, beans, or barley-meal mixed and boiled with bits of barley-bread, and bread in the form of cakes, baked with onions under a charcoal fire. Butter is found in each department of housekeeping:—their children only drink milk, and eat meat but seldom. They are very fond of dates, which they purchase very cheaply in Siwa, and use them either as dried food, or mixed with meal and bread. They eat every thing out of wooden plates with their hands, sitting on the ground. They keep their stock of water in leathern vessels, their food and other property in worsted or leathern bags, or tubs platted from date leaves. . . . They never employ themselves in fishing, and seldom in hunting, although their country abounds with hares, antelopes, partridges, and ubaras. They more frequently take the antelopes alive, at the time when they are sleeping, and being but poor marksmen, they find it more convenient to train a species of hawk for fowling.”

European medicine was in great request among them, as in most other parts of the East.—Cautery at the back of the neck is one of their most usual remedies for illness. Their religion abounds with the most abject superstition; talismans and astrological researches, magical formularies and various omens, are common to all these tribes. The picture, which Scholz has drawn of the manners of this erratic people, is one of the best which we have seen, not even excepting that of Burckhardt: their mode of intercourse and barter with foreigners and each other, the peculiarity of their dispositions, their hospitality, and their fraudulent propensities, are delineated with the vivid pencil of an accomplished master. He has added, remarks on the different pronunciation which these Bedúins give to certain letters, and adduces many words and phrases in common use among them. He has, also, described the strange contortions and gestures, with which they accompany their songs, which very much resemble the Cossac dance; in these, he has distinguished a sort of theatrical or pantomimic acting, and retraced the ancient Chorus in the general union of voices at stated intervals.

From hence, he directs his attention to the country between Agaba and Siwa. After the traveller has ascended the heights of Agaba, a vast plain abounding in plants opens upon his view, the extremity of which is no where visible to the eye. It is inhabited to the west, but totally desert to the south. In this vicinity he discovered the ancient road, which led from Parætonium to Siwa, of the identity of which he imagines himself to have acquired ample proofs. The country abounded in antiquities, and presented ample scope to the geologist. The picture of the country, which he has sketched, is of a high character, and as a naturalist, he has displayed the most indefatigable perseverance.

“The ruins of the Temple of Jupiter Ammon (now called *Haima*

Baida) are the most important and the most celebrated. . . . Of the three parts, of which this temple, according to Strabo, consisted, we now only distinguish two, in the space which the fragments occupy. The underparts of the third division are probably under the houses in the neighbourhood. We were informed of the remains of seven towns, and particularly of one heathen and Christian city. The catacombs in mount *El Mesagaret*, which the inhabitants refer to the highest antiquity, and in which, much that is interesting may be discovered by accurate investigation,—those farther off in Mount *Rakiyeh*, and others, as well as the ruins of *Busruf*—*Korasha*—*Obeiyah*, and *Lawaw*, on the eastern part of the Oasis, attest the fact. These remains, at the same time, inform us, who the earlier inhabitants were. The architecture, the devices and hieroglyphics on the temple denote the highest antiquity, and their descent from the Egyptians, who, in their ordinary works of art, surpass others as to accuracy of form.”

The modern inhabitants of Siwa dwell in four wretched villages, built in the Arabian style; they carry on a vast traffic in dates, and have such a quantity of fruits, that they annually load 500 camels with them. This traffic, however, consists in barter: for their dates, olives, beasts, and baskets made of twisted palm-leaves, the Arabs of Alexandria and Cairo, or the Bedúins, bring corn, tobacco, manufactured wares, linen, coffee, &c. Their manners and language are considerably influenced by the negroes from the interior of Africa, natives of Fez, and Mograbis, who are resident among them. They live simply, and in their dress differ but little from the Egyptians. The men mostly content themselves with a shirt (بركان), the women with a shift, and a piece of blue cloth hanging down over the back. Their dialect differs from the Arabic, although they understand and speak that language: their grammar, syntax, and characters are Arabic, yet the dialect is the *Shilahh*, which is spoken by many tribes in the north of Africa, and is worthy of investigation, as containing many words of the old Punic, and as having probably been derived from it.

Being restricted by our limits, we must pass over many chapters equally interesting and novel, contenting ourselves with the following extract from them, illustrative of the Greek historians.

“The above mentioned petrifications, which Strabo, (pp. 49, 50, ed. Casaub.) records, we again find in the whole of this region, besides which, we discover behind *Libbuk* many pieces of petrified palmtrees, dark and of great solidity, which are frequently used to show the way, are often immense, and have but little changed their original form. Fungus, also, limestone containing shells, sand, and clay, are the ingredients of the whole territory, which are observed in a mixed state, and thrown one under the other by tempests, although, often separated in whole masses. They frequently stand alone in the shape of a pyramid, and then, the

different ingredients may be very accurately distinguished, particularly the parts of iron, which alternating in dark, yellow, brown, red, or party-coloured streaks, afford an interesting survey, yet are so brittle, that we cannot sufficiently wonder at their long state of preservation. The lake extends as far as this place, and probably to the neighbourhood of *Terranch*. It was inhabited by marine animals of different sorts, and varied in places in depth and breadth. A hurricane or some other convulsion of nature burst through the sandy shore, the greatest part of the sea-water flowed through the low plains, which were towards the sea, the rest flowed in a body into the deep places, where it wonderfully fertilized the soil, and created those beautiful vales, which we call oases, or where palmtrees and many other shrubs grow together, without the careful hand of man. At present, it would be difficult to determine, where the water made its irruption. I would conjecture two spots, where I particularly remarked a gradual depression towards the sea. The first is to the north of Siwa:—the second, in the first instance, to the north-east of *Kara*, whence, it proceeds in an easterly direction, and at last in a northerly. Between *Libbuk* and *Terranch*, no point seems adapted to the irruption. To this conjecture of a former lake here may the tradition in Herodotus be referred: the lake Mæris had a subterranean efflux into the Libyan Syrtes, in a westerly direction. He cannot here speak of the former flowing of the Nile, which was caused by Menes to take the direction of the Delta. This probably was not extended so far to the west, and is, like the other branches of the Nile in the Delta, choked and entirely lost by the clouds of sand carried there by the violent west winds. This last assumption would not even elucidate one of the preceding phenomena. Our assumption, on the contrary, explains every circumstance in this region. Springs of sweet water, as at Siwa, *Kara*, *Kheishe*, &c. were frequently remarked near the sea and salt-lakes. Now, if the vegetation was first occasioned by human labour, or which is more probable, if the seeds of it floated to this place from Egypt, the luxuriance of growth can only be explained by this hypothesis.

We, now, passing by his intermediate adventures, return to him on his arrival at Cairo. Its population is composed of men of many nations, Arabs, Turks, Mamelukes, Berbers, Negroes, Jews, Copts, Armenians, Franks, Beduins, and travellers from the interior of Africa and Asia. The number of Franks amounts nearly to 1,500, they are mostly Italian merchants and manufacturers, and dwell in the quarter *Jamiâ*. There are two Roman Catholic convents here, each having a small church. An ample description of the other religious endowments of the Franks is given. The Copts have decreased under the heavy oppression of the different lords of the land: their whole number of churches is about 100, of which twenty-three, furnished with six convents, are in Cairo; but in ancient Cairo, they constitute the chief population, and have five convents. Among them modern MSS.

only, for the use of the church, are found, which, without an Arabic translation at the side, they do not understand. The monks in Upper Egypt alone now well understand the Coptic.

The title of their patriarch is *صاحب كرسي مرقس الانجيلي*

Signor Drouetti is mentioned as likely to afford valuable services to Coptic literature, because he is in possession of eight MSS. of the Bible, in the Saitical dialect, and of the σοφία Σολομώντος, in the Memphitic, which, however, are partly decayed.

Our author gives a wretched account of the Jews in Africa, and observes, that those in Abyssinia lead a nomadic life, &c. and acknowledge only the Pentateuch, as their book of religion. He has recorded the tradition of the three great Jewish caravans, which travelled to Abyssinia, in the reign of Solomon, the first with a natural son of Solomon by the Queen of Sheba, &c. His observations on the Abyssinian dialects and the catalogue of words which he has subjoined, might, if they had been more extended, reflect light on the ancient language of this singular district, and enable us to calculate the ratio of its admixture with the Arabic.

There are several libraries and literary institutions at Cairo, abounding with rare MSS.

“ The *Dare'l hakmet* (دار الحكمة), now called *Jamia-e'lázhar* (جامع الأزهر) with its invaluable library, which, according to Macrizi, was instituted in the second *Yaumadi*, A' 395, is one of the greatest literary establishments in the Ottoman dominions. It is an immense building, with many colonnades, in which pupils, to the number of two thousand, sitting in more than 150 different classes, receive instruction in reading, writing, grammar, the Koràn, and jurisprudence.

To Christians, not only the library, but the school, is inaccessible Should a rich man die without heirs, and bequeath any thing in his will to a *Jamia*, for repairs, light, carpets, and supply of other requisites, he always leaves the money to a person in high office, to a Sheikh or Imàm, or a rich merchant, who places it in security, by purchasing with it the adjoining property, houses, lands, &c.”

We must again pass over a considerable tract, and join Dr. Scholz at *Mataria*, where he saw the celebrated sycamore, under which the Holy Family is said to have rested; in the neighbourhood of which, he discovered the site of Heliopolis, an obelisk, and many sarcophagi. In one of the subsequent chapters, are many valuable remarks relative to the geology and the natural history of Palestine, and of a part of Syria, which have rarely been exceeded in luminous perspicuity, and seldom equalled by any

traveller in these regions. He observed many caves in Carmel, "which formerly had been the habitation of hermits," although we are more inclined to refer them to the sepulchral mansions of the former occupants of the country.

"The largest of them, called the School of Elijah, is much venerated both by Mohammedans and Jews. The cave is guarded by an Imâm: it is eighteen paces long and ten wide. All round, excepting on the left side, is a recess for the Divân, in the midst of which, small grottos, five more paces long and five broad, are regularly hewn in the rock. At the back part of the greater division are lamps and rags, which may have been military standards, and are very devoutly treated by the Mohammedans making a pilgrimage to this place. During my stay, many came here, who first prayed at the entrance, then in the middle, and lastly, near the lamps, terminating their devotions by kissing the insignia. The Mohammedans and Jews account it the School of Elijah;—that, in the monastery above they account the School of Elishah."

He has, also, transcribed a long Greek inscription, which he found near this place: but we conceive him in error as to the rags being military insignia. They are commonly suspended, as votive offerings, on or near the tombs of saints, wherever the religion of Mohammed has an influence: the Persians suspend them on trees, and they are, doubtless, remains of the votive offerings of the ancients.

" Me tabulâ sacer
Votivâ paries indicat uvida
Suspendisse potenti
Vestimenta maris Deo."

We regret being obliged to pass over his topographical list, his variety of Hebrew and Greek inscriptions, and the rich materials with which he has presented us, for the developement of the ancient and modern history of these countries. The ecclesiastical antiquities of Palestine, and the account of the Christian sects, are treated in considerable detail, and with much careful examination. He has largely discussed the state and manners of the inhabitants of Palestine, and appears to have traversed an extraordinary number of its cities and villages, noticing the political revolutions, which have caused the existing divisions of its government.

"Gaza lies in a somewhat uneven, but very fruitful land, at a quarter of an hour from the sea. . . . Olives, figs, oranges, sweet citrons, palm-trees, Indian figs, grow all around in vast abundance, and the most luxuriant vegetation, corn, *Malwa*, (the daily food of the inhabitants of Palestine in spring,) &c. &c., adorn this soil. . . . The inhabitants of Gaza are only Mohammedans, and schismatical Christians of the Greek church, 300 in number. The former, 5,700 in number, have above

30 mosques ; ... the Greeks have only one church. . . . Some years since, there were Jews of the sect of the Talmudists : they were formerly very numerous and affluent. Six years ago, the last Jewish family sold their house and the stones of the synagogue (which spot the *Mutsallem* changed into a garden), and removed, as the rest had done before them, back to *Halil*. The Samaritans had totally abandoned it fifty years before, and returned to Nabolus. The Franks had quitted it a much longer time, and the Armenians and Copts have not found here a fixed residence."

Dr. Scholz visited at Tiberias the synagogues of the German and Portugeze Jews, and discovered, on examining their libraries, with the exception of some MSS. of the fifteenth century, merely Hebrew and rabbinical works, printed in Italy, Germany, Amsterdam, Lisbon, and Constantinople. He found some few Druses resident at *Beirut*, who appear to be settled there for purposes of commerce. To all these cities, there is a *Mutsallem* or governor, who is appointed and generally annually exchanged by the Pacha of Acre, as well as a chief of the military. The heads of the religious sects are appointed to receive the *miri* or taxes. Every city having walls and gates (which all have, but Gaza and Nazareth) is closed in the evening, and the keys are brought to the governor, without whose permission the gates cannot be opened. Each, also, has a *Kad'hi*, who is sent from Constantinople, to whom the administration of justice in the city and district belongs.

He then describes the immense extent to which the jurisdiction of these *Mutsallems* reaches, and observes, that Christians and Jews mostly live in the cities. Over the doors in Nabolus, Jerusalem, and other cities, Arabic sentences from the Koran are commonly found, written in the Miskh character in red, denoting that the owners are *Hajjis*. Jerusalem contains about 18,000 inhabitants,—2,150 Christians, (800 Catholics, 1,100 of the Greek Church, 200 Armenians, and 50 Copts and Syrians,)—5,000 Mohammedans, and 10,000 Jews. It is situated on an uneven eminence, is surrounded with a wall, and has six gates. He is very particular respecting the Christian communities, both here and in Syria, and gives more information of the different sects, than any of his recent predecessors. He enters largely also into the difference between the colloquial and written Arabic, and discusses its dialectical variations in Egypt, Syria, and Jerusalem. The largest library in Syria he affirms to be at Acre.

We must bear in mind, that during these extensive travels, (of which we have given but a very brief and imperfect analysis,) the writer devoted his attention to biblical MSS., wherever he could discover them, and that he collated them, for

the purpose of rectifying the text of the New Testament. Hence, as this work is now in the press, to which 600 MSS. unknown to Griesbach have lent their aid, it is right that the scene of his labours should be made known to the theologian, before the work itself shall pass in review before us. As a book of travels, we cannot speak too highly of it; as a preparation to a series of biblical criticisms, we are still further bound to appreciate it, not only as making known to us one branch of the sources from whence his readings are extracted, but as certifying us, likewise, of the state of Christianity in those regions through which he passed. The other branch is his Biblical Tour in Europe, which we shall examine in a future number.

- ART. VI.—1. *A Friendly Address to the Episcopalians of Scotland, on Baptismal Regeneration; showing that it is the doctrine of Scripture, of the earliest and purest Christian Antiquity, and of the reformed Episcopal Church, as expressed in its Liturgy.* By the Right Reverend Alexander Jolly, one of the Bishops in Scotland. London: Rivington. 1826. 8vo. 56 pp. 1s. 6d.
2. *A Charge, delivered on the 14th of June, 1826, to the Clergy of the Episcopal Communion of Ross and Argyle.* By the Right Reverend David Low, LL.D. their Bishop. Bell and Bradfute, Edinburgh; and Rivington, London. 8vo. 1s. 6d.
3. *The Office of an Evangelist and Physician of the Soul: a Sermon, preached in the Episcopal Chapel at Stirling on Wednesday, October the 18th, 1826, being the Festival of St. Luke, at the Ordination of the Reverend Samuel Heed.* By the Reverend B. Bailey, M.A. Domestic Chaplain to the Right Honourable Lord Torphichen, and Minister of the Episcopal Chapel at Arbroath. Bell and Bradfute, Edinburgh; C. & J. Rivington, London; and J. Chalmers, Dundee. 8vo. pp. 36.

IN the Prospectus to this Review, we undertook to give an occasional report of the state and progress of the Episcopal Church of Scotland; but the clergy of that church have furnished us with very few opportunities of fulfilling our engagement. At this we are the more surprised inasmuch as we know some of those clergy to be at once learned, pious, and zealous for the truth. Lately indeed we had occasion to take a very brief notice of a controversy concerning *baptismal regeneration*, which originated in Edinburgh from the conduct of a clergyman of the Church of England, who seems to have intruded himself into the Scotch

Episcopal Church without being called by any authority whatever, either ecclesiastical or civil. The subject discussed in the first of the three tracts, of which we have placed the titles at the top of this article, is likewise *baptismal regeneration*; but its learned and pious author enters into no *personal* controversy with any individual. He states the doctrine as it is taught in Scripture; in the writings of the earliest fathers of the primitive church, and in the liturgy of the Church of England: and his view of it cannot be better expressed than in a passage which he quotes from a former Scotch Bishop, who appears to have been as conversant with the writings of the primitive fathers as Bishop Jolly is himself.

The Bishop, in a letter to a friend who had talked and written of a *process of regeneration*, says,—

“Your expression of a *process of regeneration*, which I do not remember to have met with, either in the Scriptures or in the writings of any of the primitive fathers, I suppose to be a mistake, for so you must allow me to call it; and indeed such a mistake it is as will draw many other consequential ones along with it, and give a very different turn to the doctrine of the Christian Œconomy. I think both the Scriptures and the primitive fathers constantly ascribe our regeneration to baptism, (including under it also what we now call confirmation,) as being that by which the spirit, the principle of this new life, is first infused into us. It is true that, although we are said to be τέλειοι (perfect) immediately upon our baptism, wherein we receive that spirit which constituteth the perfect man; yet there is a gradual progress and growth in the spiritual life answerable to that in the natural; but it is as improper, in my opinion, to call the one a process of regeneration, as it would be to call the other a process of generation, since we are as completely regenerated in baptism of the incorruptible seed of the word of God, as we are begotten at first of the corruptible seed of our earthly parents.”

This doctrine is in perfect harmony with that of the Bishop of Gloucester, the Church of England, and the Holy Scriptures.

Bishop Low's *Charge* is composed in a style very different from Bishop Jolly's *Friendly Address*, and is calculated to do more harm than good to the cause which he advocates. Of the past conduct of the English Church he speaks indeed with gratitude; but he seems to think—and there never was a more unfounded suspicion—that at present the Church of Scotland is ill treated by her southern sister.

After referring to a former Charge, of which he says the subject naturally led him to tread over ashes not yet extinguished; and observing that the subject of this Charge is not perhaps much less debatable, he enters on the subject thus:—

“Whether we regard the past or the present time, the Church of

England is to us an object of primary consideration and interest. In looking at the past, we must feel that we owe to her a debt of deep gratitude for much friendly aid, and for many essential services. Twice, in 1610, namely, and in 1661, we received from thence the episcopal succession; and some of her most distinguished dignitaries have received in return their orders from us. TILLOTSON and others were ordained by a Scotch bishop, when our Church was more depressed than she is now, and when the Church of England herself was as much humbled as her worst enemies could well wish.*

"In the suffering state to which we were reduced at the Revolution, in 1688, we received much affectionate sympathy and support. This sympathy for our severe and unmerited sufferings continued through the reign of Queen Anne; and when the legal persecution against us was carried to its utmost height by the Acts of 1746 and 1748, twenty-four bishops withdrew (from the House of Peers) with one consent, regarding these Acts, and particularly the latter, as measures equally unnecessary and unwise. Some of them, indeed, SECKER, SHERLOCK, and MADDOX, declared, without hesitation, during the progress of the bill, that they thought it much worse than unwise, and that it was in fact nothing less than the persecution and proscription of the very religion which was established in England, in Ireland, and in the colonies.

"After that unfortunate period our Church was involved in a cloud of deep obscurity, which was first dissipated by the consecration of Dr. Seabury, in 1784. This event brought us again into a certain degree of notice in England, and somewhat revived the interest and renewed in our behalf the sympathy of *real* churchmen in that part of the kingdom.

"The repeal of the penal laws, in 1792, restored to us the rights of simple toleration, clogged, however, with a restriction in regard to our orders, which is neither generous nor just. In acknowledging the gratitude which we owe to the Church of England, I maintain that we have fully merited all that we have received, by the uniform, the consistent, and the conscientious discharge of our duty, particularly in that we have ever steadily avoided all sectarian courses and connections, by which, had we been so deluded, or so depraved, we might certainly have done very serious injury to the Church of England, both at home and abroad. No one can calculate the effects which the power connected with a *real* episcopacy might have produced, or may yet produce in the hands of the Methodists, or even of the high evangelical party in the Church."

Bishop Low is not probably aware that by some of the Wesleyan Methodists application was actually made to the late Primus of the Scotch Episcopal Church for episcopal consecration to one of their preachers, soon after Dr. Seabury had been consecrated. The late Dr. Berkeley of Canterbury was in possession of the letter in which the application was made to Bishop Skinner, together with that prelate's refusal to comply with the request. We readily believe Bishop Low, therefore, when he

* See TODD'S Deans of Canterbury, and EVELYN'S Memoirs.

says that there never has been, nor is at present the slightest danger of the Scotch bishops conferring the advantage of a real episcopacy either on the Methodists or on any other English sectarists. And we rejoice in the belief, not so much for the sake of the English as of the Scotch church: to the former such a step might prove inconvenient and even injurious; to the latter it would be an overwhelming disgrace.

Bishop Low complains that, in consequence of the restriction upon Scottish orders in the Act of 1792, several clergymen were daily intruding themselves into a church, the authority of whose bishops they despise, and not only despise themselves, but by means of those restrictive acts of the legislature, are able to persuade well-meaning though ill-informed men, that it is by the English Church really considered as despicable.

“For those clergymen of English and Irish ordination (not driven hither by some imperious or mysterious necessity, for which we cannot account,) who have come among us regularly, and not from birth or connection in our country, or by fair election and regular testimonials have obtained charges in our Church, I entertain as sincere a respect and regard as I do for those clergy who from their infancy have been trained amongst ourselves, and were specially ordained for the duties of our ministry. The former will not, therefore, for a moment imagine that any animadversion that I may make can affect them any more than I can mean it to affect myself, or any other of the indigenous ministers of whom our ecclesiastical body is composed. On the contrary, I feel that to some of them we are under the greatest obligations, and they are men on whom I could rely with perfect confidence in any emergency or difficulty affecting the honour and the interest of the humble communion, of which, if need were, they would be the stay and the support in future, as they are, being connected with another and a more flourishing Church, the ornaments at present.

“Men, however, who intrude amongst us, without putting it in our power to ascertain how they conducted themselves in their former residence, and who take advantage of any kindness shown them to insinuate themselves, and eventually to exercise strong popular influence, we have but too much reason to suspect, notwithstanding their high pretensions to superior sanctity. Of this we have repeatedly had painful experience since I became a minister of this Church; and one instance is recent, of a man thus insinuating himself into a charge in Edinburgh, who affected and acquired the character of a very holy and spiritual person, but who at length was obliged to depart in haste, to avoid a public criminal prosecution, and its ignominious consequences. Of the same class of intruders are to be found some who, with words and writings smoother than oil, and under the pretence of an extraordinary purity of doctrine, can, without remorse, expose and calumniate their brethren—ridicule every law of order, of peace, and of charity—and, with an effrontery without a parallel, claim to be themselves the only *Gospel* ministers in a

church, whose doctrine they disown, and whose discipline they disobey. These men, their principle and their practices, I earnestly warn every brother, as well lay as cleric, *plusquam incendium fugere.*"

These, it must be acknowledged, are serious evils; and we are confident that the rulers of the Church of England would gladly co-operate in removing them. But the proper remedy is still to be discovered. The reason, we believe, which Archbishop Moore assigned for introducing the restraining clause into all the acts in which it occurs, was his dread of half-educated clergymen from Scotland and America pouring into England, and obtaining curacies at least, if not livings, in the Church. This dread was not unnatural; and it was certainly his Grace's duty to prevent such inundations of half-educated men into the Church of England; but this, we apprehend, might have been done by other means than an absolute prohibition of Scotch orders—a prohibition which naturally wounds the feelings, lowers the reputation, and emboldens the adversaries of a sister whom we ought to cherish with especial kindness, but who is at present worse used than strangers to our blood and faith. A priest or deacon of the Romish or Greek Church, on renouncing his errors before the proper authority, taking the necessary oaths, and making the necessary subscriptions, is admissible to execute the functions of his order in any church in England; but such a privilege is peremptorily denied to every one who has received orders from the Churches of America and Scotland. This strange anomaly affords reasonable ground for complaint, and, without pretending to say that the means of removing it are obvious, we are sanguine enough to hope that some scheme may be devised, which will remove the unjust stigma now attached to the Church in Scotland, without exposing our English bishops to the unpleasant duty of re-examining persons who are already in orders. But the arrangement of such a measure is a delicate and difficult task, and will be most effectually checked by any further manifestation of that unhappy spirit and temper, which are too visible in the Charge of Bishop Low.

The tract which stands last at the head of this Article, is a sermon preached by a clergyman, who, if he be, as we imagine he is, of English ordination, is surely one of those for whom Bishop Low professes as sincere a regard and respect, as for those who from their infancy had been trained in the Scotch Episcopal Church. The subject of the discourse is distinctly stated in the title; and Mr. Bailey, in treating it, displays considerable ingenuity and address, in adapting what he says as well to the *festival* as to the *occasion* on which he was preaching.

It is not easy to select from a single sermon, where the whole is connected together by that which the father of criticism calls a

beginning, a *middle*, and an *end*, any short passage which will give the reader a complete view of the preacher's doctrine. Mr. Bailey, after explaining the meaning of the word *evangelist*, showing that it is not the official title of any *permanent* order of ministers in the Church, but given to *all* orders who, being employed to preach the Gospel to the Heathen, were so inspired as to be able to preach the truth, and nothing but the truth, as it is in Jesus; and observing, that the original and inspired Evangelists having left so perfect a rule of faith behind them, that no supernatural inspiration is now required, says,

"By labour and by learning, by prayer and watchfulness, with such assistance as every Christian, and certainly every clergyman, may expect, and will unquestionably derive, if he be in earnest, from the ordinary operations of Grace, must we *do the work of evangelists, and fulfil our ministry*. These are the weapons of our warfare; and these, if sedulously exerted, are amply sufficient for our victory. With these we must *fight the good fight*; and that we may *finish our career* with success, we must *keep the faith*.

"There is, however, another very essential, nay indispensable, duty of an evangelist; besides *keeping the faith* and preaching *sound doctrine*, he must, if possible, keep the *unity* of the faith. We read in the Acts of the Apostles, that the primitive Christian converts, after they had gladly received the word and been baptised, continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and *fellowship*—*κοινωνία*—and in breaking of bread, and in prayers, with their fellow-Christians. Much, indeed, is talked, in this age, of *evangelical doctrine*; but *evangelical fellowship*—the communion in *breaking of bread* in the Lord's Supper, and in prayers—is entirely lost sight of, as though these subjects of *fellowship* had never been mentioned in the sacred oracles of revealed religion. But this Christian fellowship is inculcated in the strongest terms by the first preachers of the Gospel, as well as shown in the example of the primitive Christians.

"To exhort every disciple of Christ, who is under his ministry, to imitate, by his own example, as well as by his exhortations, all Christians to this blessed *fellowship*—in spirit, in the sacraments, and in the public worship of God—is a very chief and important work of an evangelist; and he who raises or supports a schism—whether a clergyman or a lay person, but more especially a clergyman—is guilty of a very great and dangerous sin."

Mr. Bailey enforces this doctrine in very strong terms in a note, which we are much inclined to insert here; but the Article has already swelled beyond the limits within which we hoped to compress it. We must, therefore, conclude with observing, that there is little danger indeed of the Church of England and Ireland being inundated by half-educated clergymen from a church, in which the Doctors Jolly and Low are bishops, and Mr. Bailey a presbyter.

ART. VI.—*The History of the Reign of Henry the Eighth: comprising the Political History of the Commencement of the English Reformation.* By Sharon Turner, F.S.A. & R.A.S.L. Second Edition. London. Longman & Co. 1827. 2 vols. 8vo. 26s.

IN the present state of the controversy between the Churches of England and Rome, it was not probable that the ground of History, however much previously beaten, should escape fresh occupation; not only by such as entered into the dispute in the guise of avowed Polemics, but by others also whom the din of arms might, at first, attract as spectators, rather than as partakers of the contest. Accordingly, a very brief period of time has produced no less than three new Histories of the Reformation; each widely distinguished from its fellows by the separate objects, talents and prepossessions of its writer; and two of them, at least, demanding attention on account of certain novelties which they have ventured to introduce. Mr. Soames has been content with the humble, but by no means unuseful, task of compilation, abridgment, and rearrangement: but Dr. Lingard and Mr. Turner are of more ambitious temperament. The first of these gentlemen has opened a private Still, in which, by a variety of adulterating processes, he has mixed together old liquors till they appear new; and dashed and flavoured them by that which the dealers technically name *surplus extractive matter*, till they have acquired an aroma fit for the gunpowder palates of his customers. The second has fairly and honestly imported neat commodities from the genuine vineyards; but, as we think, has occasionally failed in the subsequent labour of bottling and corking. Or, to adopt a loftier metaphor, Dr. Lingard is a knowing renovator of ancient sculpture for the modern market; who thoroughly understands, as it best suits his purpose, how to turn a “graceless Venus” to “a Virgin,” or to “christen Jove” by investing him with the “Keys of Peter:” while Mr. Turner, on the other hand, is an ardent virtuoso, who, in the simplicity of connoisseurship, now and then calls Pan, Apollo, and worships that for Hebe which the artist himself did not intend should be better than Hecate.

But the main object which Mr. Turner has contemplated in the composition of the volumes now before us, will be best learned by attention to his own statement of it. Having already brought down the History of England to the close of the reign of Henry VII., we are not surprised to hear that he began to feel his sight somewhat bewildered by the wide prospect which opened to him in that which, in common with Lord Bolingbroke, he considers

to be the *modern* history of our country. The fatigue to be encountered, if he pursued his path, alarmed him, and he paused for rest. The inquiries, however, of two friends, Messrs. Southey and Butler, (both leading controversialists, though in opposite interests, on the period which he was approaching,) on some points which he felt unable to answer to his own satisfaction, decided him once again to engage in researches which had been suspended, but not abandoned. He recommenced, therefore, with a determination of avoiding repetitions from former printed accounts, of declining direct entrance upon the disputes which his contemporaries were agitating, and of depending for his information upon a diligent inspection of all the MS. remains to which access could be obtained. These consisted, principally, of a very rich collection of despatches and correspondence preserved in the British Museum, which, he thinks, has been singularly disregarded by former writers. Among these documents are to be found Letters from Ambassadors and Agents, in all parts of Europe, to the King himself, to Wolsey, and to the Ministers who succeeded him; their several instructions, and other very important and voluminous State Papers.

It is impossible to peruse Mr. Turner's pages without a conviction that the most praiseworthy diligence and indefatigable labour has been exercised by him, in consulting, transcribing, and arranging these curious MSS.: and, doubtless, many particulars of minute History will be found illustrated, and many errors or perversions of other authors corrected, by the light thus gathered from sources hitherto unexplored. This is no trifling merit, but it is not *all* the merit to which that class of writers aspires among whom Mr. Turner has sought to enrol his name; and beyond this our praise cannot extend. We have seldom been more perplexed than in our attempts to determine the grounds upon which Mr. Turner, for the most part, builds the judgments which he passes on facts and characters. With his narrative we have but little quarrel; but in all which a present Scotch Professor or a future lecturer at the London University would call the *Philosophy of History*, that is, in plain speaking, in his reflections and deductions, he is involved, obscure, and, very often, contradictory. Moreover, all those qualities which must so much heighten and increase his value in social and private life, (and no man, we are convinced, possesses more of these,) his gentleness of spirit, his piety, his benevolence and his tenderness of heart, are perpetually oozing out through his pen, and meandering in sentimental and soporific paragraphs, in season and out of season, to the manifest detriment of that evenness and sobriety which Historical composition demands, more, perhaps, than any other. Lastly, his style is

so tinselled and embroidered with cumbrous metaphor, that we frequently have much ado to discover the threads of texture for which we are searching under the plaster of ornaments with which they are oppressed and overwhelmed.

After all, perhaps, Mr. Turner's leading fault is that of being too much enamoured of his hero; and of having created to himself a *beau ideal*, for the maintenance of which he is obliged to have perpetual recourse to distortion of reasoning. So that although unable to deny, and, for the most part, little seeking to palliate, in the very moment of relation, any of the enormities which the selfish and merciless Tyrant concerning whom he writes committed, he no sooner gets them once out of immediate sight, and leaves the sacrifice of a Minister or the murder of a Wife a page or two behind him, than we might imagine ourselves transported to the times of a Titus or a Trajan. For it is not by raising any "Historic Doubts" that he would persuade us that posterity has been deceived in its appreciation of Henry's character; it is rather by producing abstract arguments on his motives. If Mr. Turner had been actuated by a similar inclination to prove that Richard III. was immaculate, he would freely have granted the murder at Tewkesbury, the assassination of Henry VI., the butt of Malmsey, the poisoning of Edward IV., the smothering of the infant Princes, and such other reputed peccadillos as have been generally ascribed to the Crookbacked, and then would have proceeded, with the most imperturbable gravity, logically to demonstrate that these crimes were not the result either of ferocity or ambition.

That we have not mistaken the hypothesis which Mr. Turner undertakes to maintain respecting Henry, is clear from almost the very outset of his work.

"The present subject of the commencement of the Modern History of England, has suggested these reflections; because the reign of Henry the Eighth was the opening of one of those emerging periods of reviving splendor in the cultivation of the human mind: and because some of the ablest judges and most zealous promoters of this happy change expressly connect it with the example and conduct of the English sovereign."—vol. i. p. 5.

The early part of Henry's reign was such as might be expected from a Prince careless of the expenditure, though by no means so of the acquisition of money, fond of splendour, devoted to pleasure, ambitious, brave, and powerful. His Court was, perhaps, the most magnificent and attractive in Europe; and the youthful Monarch himself was not among its least brilliant ornaments. Exclusive of his personal accomplishments, which we may readily believe to have been of the highest order, he possessed

quickness of parts, and had turned this to advantage; for he had acquired the current Literature of his day, such as it was; and could dispute with sufficient subtilty on 'Dialectics and School Divinity.' Thus much (and not more) may be predicated of his talents and attainments from the Works which he has left behind him; and these are the only true criterion by which he can now be estimated. The intellect of every reigning Prince is rated at an equal height by most contemporary writers, who are honoured with access to the royal person; and we might just as well believe that the Venetian Ambassador, Justiniani, spoke the truth of Henry's bodily powers, when he saluted him as "Apollo and Mars," as give literal credit to the shrewd and penetrating Erasmus, when he wrote that the young King's happy and versatile genius "prevailed in an incredible manner to whatever subject he addressed himself," and that "the soundness and acuteness of his mind would be surprising in the most learned Theologians."

Mr. Turner dwells with evident pleasure on the chivalrous pastimes of Henry's youth. They are related *con amore*, and with good taste.

"But the great enjoyment of Henry was from his personal prowess in the just and tournament. His first exhibition of it after his coronation, was made the next winter in Richmond Park. He had never ran a course publicly before; but, as some gentlemen were justing, two armed strangers, unknown to any one, joined the lists; and of these one broke so many spears against his opponents, as to attract great praise. His companion, who at first had been successful, at last received a wound from Lord Abergavenny's brother that was likely to be fatal. At this period, one person, looking at the admired knight, suddenly cried out, 'God save the king!' Every one was astonished; and Henry, discovering himself, gave great pleasure to the people from his triumph and his condescension.

"The temper of his mind will be best displayed by noticing his amusements. He tried his skill at the ring in the presence of the Spanish ambassadors. He went richly armed, with a plume of feathers waving from his head down to the saddle, and with trumpets sounding before him. Of twelve courses, he bore away the ring five times, and thrice touched it. Surpassing his competitors, he won the prize.

"On May day, with all his knights and gentlemen in white satin, and with his guard and yeomen in sarsnet, he went to fetch the green bows of the spring. Placing them in their caps, they took their bows and arrows, and went to the woods. He shot as strong and to as great a length as any of his guard.

"At Whitsuntide, with two companions, he challenged all comers to combat at the barriers, with targets, and casting off spears of eight feet long, and then to fight twelve strokes with two-handed swords. He was assailed by several valiant and strong persons, but displayed so much hardy prowess and great strength, that he obtained the chief applause.

"Removing to Windsor, he began a progress through the country. In this he exercised himself daily in shooting, singing, dancing, wrestling, and casting of the bar; he also indulged himself more intellectually in playing on recorders, on the flute and on virginals; in composing songs, making ballets, and in setting two masses. To these he added hunting, hawking, and shooting, besides occasional jousts and turnneys.

"His love of robust exercises appeared again in October, when he fought a stout and tall German with battle axes, and in the next month he challenged all comers with spears at tilt one day, and with swords at turney the next. He broke more spears than any, and in both the contests carried the prize."—vol. i. pp. 56—58.

These diversions, however, were not always unattended with danger, and old men shook their heads and said, no steel was so strong but it might be broken, and no horse so sure of foot but he might fall, and one moment might leave the nation without a Tudor King. These apprehensions, it seems, were more than once well nigh verified.

"The king once experienced the peril of these sports. Having a new armor of his own device, such as no armorer had before seen, he wished to essay it. His antagonist was the Duke of Suffolk. They took their stations at the opposite ends of the tilt. His spear was delivered to the king; but in his eagerness, he forgot to pull down and fasten the visor of his helmet: the signal was given, and he charged with his usual energy, unknowing that his face was bare. The duke, who had closed the frontal of his helmet, could not see at any distance, and as he knew Henry never made it child's play, and always wished a real and manly encounter, he prepared as usual to give a vigorous onset. It happened that he had determined to strike the king's head, and couched his lance so as to clash upon his face. As the steeds ran, the people saw the king's uncovered cheeks, and cried vociferously 'hold!' but neither of the tilers heard or heeded in his impetuous career; and the duke's spear, exactly aimed, as they came near, when no human force could check the collision, struck the king on the eye-brow, right under the defence of his head-piece. Nothing could have saved him, but that a part of the skull-cap, to which the visor is fastened, and which being always covered by that, was never made with any care, received the blow. It happened to be strong enough to resist the spear's blunted point. As Henry never shrunk from his vigorous seat, he stood the full collision, and the weapon shivered to pieces on his face. Every one thought him killed; and several ran upon the duke to avenge the mischief. But the king soon recovered from the unusual shock on a part so little guarded; and to show both his safety and good humor, called his armorer to put his helmet again together, and had the hardihood to run six more courses, amid the wonder and applause of his admiring subjects.

"Two years afterwards, the king's venturesome spirit put him in great danger of death in another of his favorite pastimes. He was fond of falconry: in following his hawk at Hitchin, he came to a wide ditch, and planted his pole in the middle, to spring over it; but as he took his

leap, the pole broke with his weight, and he fell into the water, where his face was detained by the adhesive clay at the bottom, into which it had sunk. If his footman had not jumped into the water in time to disengage and raise his head, he would have been soon drowned."—vol. i. pp. 66, 67.

The early and harmless pursuits of Nero have been recorded in like manner by *his* biographer also, who speaks of them very much as they deserve. *Hæc partim nullâ reprehensione, partim non mediocri laude digna, in unum contuli, ut secernerem a probris et sceleribus quibus de dehinc dicam.* (Suet. Nero, 19.) With Henry, as with the Roman Emperor, those pages which contain accounts of his youthful sports, are those alone in all his history which are not sullied by memorials of cruelty and guilt.

Respecting Wolsey, it would not now be easy to advance any authentic matter which has escaped the close personal observation of Cavendish, or the diligence of Fiddes. Mr. Turner has collected faithfully the most remarkable particulars of the habits and manners of this extraordinary man; but has failed, as we think, to estimate him at the high standard which is deserved by the great powers of his genius, his magnificent views, and his long and successful career as a Statesman. During a period fertile in men of superior intellect, Wolsey stood pre-eminent, and was arbiter of the destinies of Europe. His friendship and influence were the chief objects which Monarchs, rarely equalled, never surpassed, in policy, activity, and power, solicited and gloried to obtain. We never rise from the perusal of *any* History of England without considering this much-abused Cardinal, in the early part of his life, as the greatest Minister whom our country has produced; and assuredly we never turn to Cavendish's simple and most touching Memoir, without a conviction that the meek and patient endurance of contumelies, wrongs, and persecution, which the discarded favourite exhibited, in his closing scenes, fully atoned for the Pride (that never-ending theme of obloquy) with which he is justly chargeable during his prosperity. Towards Henry he was blameless; and were it not that later deeds of atrocity have made the King's ingratitude a grain in the scale of his crimes, this of itself would have been sufficient to stamp his memory with infamy. With all Wolsey's faults (and we are far from denying that there is a sufficient harvest of them to gratify the uttermost malice of his enemies) be it remembered that, during his long administration, the government of Henry was comparatively mild, and that this Minister stood as the sole floodgate which stemmed the fury of the Tyrant's wrath. But no sooner had the King tasted blood, after the dismissal of his faithful servant, than

he washed his hands and deeply dyed his garments in the richest streams which flowed in the veins of his subjects.

It is to such passages as that which we are about to cite below, in summary of Wolsey's character, (and such are not sparingly interspersed throughout Mr. Turner's work,) that one of our prefatory remarks is addressed.

"In contemplating such an extravagant specimen of human arrogance and vanity as Wolsey in his mature age chose to become, it is delightful and consoling to the mind to remember that the most stupendous Being in nature is peculiarly distinguished by the absence of all pride, and by the perpetual practice of that amenity in himself which he has enjoined to his creatures. There is nothing ostentatious or supercilious about him. He expands a mighty creation before our eyes in quiet sublimity, but leaves the operation of its silent grandeur to its own impressions on our unprejudiced sensibility, without projecting himself in personal pomp or dramatic spectacle before us, challenging and compelling an extorted applause. His natural and ordinary appeals to our reason and our feelings are tranquil, intellectual, and unassuming. We must seek him, to find him. We must trace the wondrous hand which is everywhere discernible, though always invisible. In his revelations, he calls not for our adulation or our applause. His request, as to himself, is for our love; and as to our own happiness, for our obedience to his wise and kind legislation, in order to ensure and perpetuate the felicity we covet. Praise is the natural language of our gratitude and adoration: the presented homage of our judgment. For who can candidly survey the magnificence of nature, the benignity of its provisions, and the skill of its multiform construction, and withhold the hallelujah, the benediction, and the sympathy? The noblest spirits of the most enlightened ages have felt it impossible not to breathe the aspirations of their delighted wisdom, and affectionate veneration; but yet the Sovereign of the Universe never claims by personal ostentation what is indeed of no value, if not the heartfelt and spontaneous tribute. Free from all imposing, conceited, and fastidious pride, he displays as his settled character the most condescending kindness; for without this divine quality, would he have deigned to plan and organize animals and insects, whom even we despise, and watch over the robin and the worm as graciously as over man? Nothing is too insignificant for his care, nor too minute for his creation; and nothing, however lowly, is forgotten by his goodness. What a contrast to man! who looks down with contempt on what is inferior, and is so often uneasy till his self-love is gratified by the awe and wonder, the commendations and flattery, which he can extort by domineering arrogance and exerted tyranny; or by the tawdry splendor of manufactured parade."—vol. i. pp. 198—200.

The intrigues of the Constable Bourbon are pursued at much length by Mr. Turner, and are illustrated by copious references to original despatches. We are by no means convinced, however,

that the extent of his discoveries respecting their connection with Henry VIII., is as great as he imagines.

“ On the transactions of the celebrated Duke of Bourbon, the author has occupied a space which he has thought was not disproportioned to their novelty and importance in our annals. The peculiar connection of all his movements with English History has never been noticed before; and much which is developed in these pages from official papers, and from his own letters, will be found as new to the French nation as to our own. It has not been known before to our neighbours any more than to ourselves, as far as the writer has hitherto observed, that this personage, so famed as the Connetable du Bourbon, swore allegiance to Henry VIII. and engaged to make him King of France, and invaded it for that purpose; and was earnest, notwithstanding his failures, to renew and to consummate his project.”—Pref. p. ix.

Surely thus much is directly affirmed by Guicciardini; and although neither the time nor place at which Bourbon actually swore allegiance to Henry as future King of France, may have been precisely specified, there never could exist any doubt, from the words of the Italian Historian, that Henry, before his invasion of that country, in 1523, had received either such an assurance, or one fully equivalent to it, from the mouth, or under the hand, of the Constable. Guicciardini, in the commencement of his narrative of the conspiracy and revolt of Bourbon, (lib. xv.) expressly says, that he had *confederato pochi mesi innanzi con Cesare et col Ré d'Inghilterra CON PATTO*. Hence it was known that a positive Treaty existed; and a little onward he adds its terms, *di quello che s'acquistava haveva da ritenere per se la Provenza permutando il titolo di Conte al titolo di Re di Provenza, la qual Contea appartenersegli per ragioni dipendenti da gli Angioini pretendeva, l'altre cose tutte dovevano pervenire nel Ré d'Inghilterra*; words which an author of such common occurrence as Hume has almost literally translated (xxix) without reference or acknowledgment. In the instructions also given to Dr. Sampson and Sir Richard Jerningham, to treat with the Emperor concerning Bourbon, the following marked passage occurs:—*Juramentumque Homagii et Fidelitatis a prefato Duce pro Nobis et Nomine Nostro quo ipse Nos pro vero Rege Franciæ recognoscet et acceptabit, Nobisque tanquam Rege Franciæ fideliter serviet atque obediet, et ad Mandata Nostra tanquam Supremi Domini sui et Regis Franciæ promptus et paratus erit, Recipiendi et Acceptandi*. This document which is preserved in the British Museum (Bibl. Cott. Vespasian, c. 2.) has been printed by Rymer, (*Fædera* xiii. 794.) In point of fact, therefore, all the novelty which has been elicited by an examination of Pace's despatches, is resolved into an account of the particular method which was forced upon Bourbon, whereby

he was to pledge his faith. We do not think that such a discovery quite bears out the claim which has been made for it.

"The momentous consequences to Henry, to Europe, and to mankind, which ultimately followed from what the Duke of Bourbon from this time planned, directed or achieved, make the history of his defection an important part of the History of England, although from not being studied in the official documents that exist, its impressive connexion with our annals has hitherto been little noticed, and some of its most interesting incidents entirely unknown."—vol. i. p. 299.

The transactions at Pavia and the defeat and capture of Francis I. before that city, are related very clearly and much at large, and the particulars which Mr. Turner has skilfully combined from the standard authorities present an interesting picture. The following description of the personal behaviour of the gallant and unfortunate King is conveyed in spirited touches.

"In this irrecoverable state, his remaining army breaking all around him, the king made an effort to save himself by the bridge of the Ticino. The flying French all took that direction, pursued by their unsparing conquerors; but when they reached the river, they found, to their consternation, as Bonaparte at Leipsic, the bridge broken down. The fracture had been begun by the rabble, who had been driven out, that the Spaniards might not pursue them. The garrison of Pavia had completed the destruction; a doom of instant fate to thousands! Large bodies of the fugitives rushing on to reach it, perished in the river, as they trampled over its fragments; others were pushed into the stream by the impetuosity of their pursuers, and great numbers were slaughtered on its banks. Francis had arrived at the fatal spot, but to find no passage from it. He was soon surrounded by a concourse from which no valour could long extricate him. He fought with infuriated and unabating courage, wild with the disaster and disappointment, careless of death, and not unwilling to share it with his best friends who were falling in unavailing efforts to preserve him. He got out of the press a short time, but four Spanish arquebussiers pursued him. They knew not who he was, but they saw a rich dress, and the collar of St. Michael, and called upon him to surrender. He gave no answer, and striving to pass the outside one who had discharged his weapon, the man struck its butt end violently on his horse, which felled it. The king sank down with the dying animal into a ditch. As he fell, an officer, with some of Pescara's light cavalry, reached the spot, and marked his fine apparel. Not yet guessing the prize, but glancing at the ransom, he told the Spaniards they should share the booty if they would not kill him; Francis spoke not, nor was known. He was now lying insensible, oppressed by his horse. At this juncture Pomperand, the friend of Bourbon, and who had escaped with him, recognised his former sovereign, but concealing his knowledge, ordered the soldiers to pass on and pursue the victory, as their captive was already dead. The men then insisted on stripping him, when Pomperand, seeing the viceroy coming near, rode suddenly up to him, and

revealed the state of the King of France. Lannoy hurried to the spot, removed the dead bodies that had last perished to protect him, and raising him up from under his steed, recalled him to sensibility, asked him if he was the king, and desired him to surrender. Francis faintly inquired the rank of his questioner, and finding it to be the viceroy, said, that he surrendered himself to the emperor. The viceroy kissed his hand with great reverence, and as such received him. He was immediately disarmed to his hosen and jacket, and carefully examined. He had been struck by many balls on his breast-plate, but its strength had prevented their penetration. Two wounds only were observed on his face and hand. He was conducted from the bloody field to a monastery near Pavia, and there served respectfully at his refreshment by both the viceroy and Bourbon. The latter standing alone a long time reasoning with him, in answer to his reproaches."—vol. i. pp. 411—414.

Strange it is, that a pen which can write thus vividly and simply, should soon afterwards be delivered of such maudlin hyper-mentality as pules through the succeeding reflections on the King's imprisonment at Madrid.

"Escape was rendered as impossible as walls, seclusion, hourly examination, and personal inspection could make it, and Francis would have sunk to all the misery of despondence, but that until its reason fails, it is impossible for human nature to prevent the visitations of hope. This immortal child of imagination and desire, with the wings of a sylph, the voice of a syren, and the wand of an enchantress, mocks the power of the severest calamity, and will never be long absent with its inestimable consolations. It had sprung up anew in the bosom of Francis, on every proposition that had been suggested for his release; and though perishing as each was rejected, yet such is the magical nature of this divine associate of our intellectual essence, that it never dies but to revive, although it revives but to expire. The king's heart became sick with melancholy in Spain, at the vicissitudes and procrastination of the negotiations for his release, and more than one illness shook his frame as his captivity continued. But this unextinguishable comforter still upheld him; and that it might be thus operative, Charles at times sent him favourable messages; and when these no longer excited, and his indispositions became dangerous, roused fresh expectation by a courteous visit. Sweetest guest of the human heart, and the most constant friend of human life, hope is always whispering pleasure to us while it lives, and never disappoints us but to replace its fading flowers by newer blossoms and more alluring fruit. Reason may chide the mental fairy for its delusions, and moral satire may proscribe it as a dreamer and an enthusiast: yet what bosom would renounce the felicity it bestows; for it always exists with this glorious appendage, that in its sublimer range and final objects, it gives to earth-trained, but earth-spurning thought, an expansion, an elevation, a nobility, an aspiration, an energy, and a home, which link the grave with heaven, the heart with its Creator, and the spirit with His eternity."—vol. i. pp. 446, 447.

We now approach the really *English* portion of this History; to which, not a little to our surprize, Mr. Turner has allotted scarcely more than a third of his volumes. It is not our intention to follow him, page by page, in this well-known part of his narrative: we shall rather endeavour to produce instances in which he has successfully detected the mistaken or false representations of others, and to notice a few points on which we think he himself has written unadvisedly.

Whether the project of Divorce from Katharine of Arragon, originated with Wolsey or with Henry himself, is a question which now can never be decided. Mr. Turner argues stoutly for the first. But it is of little import. If Wolsey *did* suggest it, from State reasons combined with personal dislike, Henry willingly admitted that which, perhaps, already was not wholly strange to his mind; although he had contemplated it with widely different views from those entertained by the Cardinal. The hypocritical and revolting plea of conscience advanced by the Monarch, (for this appears to have been entirely his own,) in order to promote the gratification of one passion, was readily adopted by the Minister to forward the hopes of another; so that the ambition of the wily Statesman unwittingly pandered to the lust of the Royal suitor. Little did Wolsey perceive at the time in which he was soliciting the hand of the Princess Renée, (for the attainment of which the Divorce was indispensable,) that his master's affections were fixed elsewhere, and that opposition to them would eventually work his own downfall.

The return of Anne Boleyn to England, is assigned by Mr. Turner, on very reasonable grounds, to the Spring of the same year (1527) during the summer of which Wolsey proceeded on this bootless matrimonial embassy. Dr. Lingard, indeed, strives to show that it took place five years earlier; but then he *appears* to throw together, as if they had taken place simultaneously, three occurrences of which the dates are very widely removed from each other: namely, the elevation of her father to the dignity of Viscount Rochford, (in 1525,) the rupture which the King effected between the lady and her admirer, Lord Percy, (in 1527,) and a present to her of jewels from the royal hand, which is fixed by a letter accompanying them, in May, 1528. The removal of Lord Percy from Court was, as Dr. Lingard surmises, the first hint which Anne received of the impression which she had made on the King's heart. Now, if she returned in 1522, as he wishes it to be believed, she whom Henry afterwards loved so passionately and to whom he sacrificed so largely, must have filled, during five years, a prominent situation in his Court without attracting his attention. Princes are not usually very solicitous to conceal their

hopes of female encouragement, nor are those to whom they are addressed often backward in perceiving them: yet we have the express testimony of Cavendish, that even after Lord Percy had been commanded to avoid her, "she knew nothing of the King's intended purpose;" and the dismay of Wolsey on learning it, soon after his arrival from France, proves his own ignorance of an attachment which no one was more deeply interested in knowing, and which, if it had really existed, could scarcely have been concealed from his penetration.

The calumnies of Saunders against the youthful reputation of Anne, are so overcharged as to defeat their own purpose. They are disclaimed on all hands, and it is, therefore, unnecessary to refute them here. If it were not so, Mr. Turner has furnished sufficient arguments for the purpose, both from the close paternal vigilance and high and honourable character of Sir Thomas Boleyn, and from the unimpeachable morals of the two Courts in which herself held distinguished appointments. These slanders have not been re-asserted by Dr. Lingard; who, however, has given but a faint denial to another infamous charge, that Lady Boleyn had been the secret mistress of Henry; and in one place, with the intention of implying that a still fouler accusation existed, has studiously termed Anne "the daughter of Lady Boleyn." Nor has he scrupled to state, positively and without qualification, that Anne's elder sister, Mary, had lived openly with the King in concubinage. This scandal is rested upon a paragraph in what Dr. Lingard terms *a private letter* from Cardinal Pole to Henry; a paragraph which, most probably, Dr. Lingard has never seen, unless at secondhand; since it occurs, as Mr. Turner has shown, not in a *private letter*, but in the *published* tract, *Pro Eccl. Un. Def.* Upon the strength of this sentence, Anne is represented by Dr. Lingard as "supplanting" Mary in the royal affections, and as throughout manifesting entire willingness to marry the brutal seducer, who, as she well knew, had *violated* (such is Pole's expression) her own sister.

That Pole is not always to be trusted is clearly shown by Mr. Turner in another important instance, which it is not possible to divest of the character of deliberate falsehood. In the Treatise already cited, he affirms that Henry confessed to the Emperor that the marriage of Katharine with his Brother Arthur had not been consummated. Whether the fact was so or not, it is not here necessary to inquire. All History vouches that Henry asserted the consummation. A document still exists in the State Paper Office, in which it is distinctly notified in his own hand writing—*ce parfait consummation ensuyvy*—it was so pertinaciously adhered to by Henry on all occasions of which we have any record, and

manifestly was of such importance to the success of his suit for Divorce, that it is quite incredible to suppose he ever should confess the falsehood of this assertion to the very person of all others, whom it was most his interest to convince of its truth.

So much for Pole's general authority; but, in the particular instance before us, Mr. Turner has given yet stronger proof of the little credit which he deserves.

"Such a connection, if a fact, must have been known like all other facts, and as such, either seen by Pole, or learnt by him from those who saw or knew it. But instead of stating it from personal observation or information, he says expressly, that he learnt it from neither. He refers it to the pope, who being such an interested and bitter adversary, can only be the most suspicious of all authorities. 'Verum, quo pacto ego hoc scio.' 'But by what means do I know this? because at the same time at which thou rejectedst the papal dispensation for thy brother's wife, thou contendedst with great force from the same pope, that it might be lawful for thee to marry the sister of her who had been thy concubine.' p. 267. But we have a full account of the letters to the pope, and of the discussions about it before him, in the official papers from Wolsey and the ambassadors to Rome, and no parts of them mention it. That such a thing should not be known by Pole in or from England, but nine years afterwards be learnt from Rome, are such circumstances as ought to nullify any tale of slander that is not otherwise supported.

"But Pole incapacitates himself from any credibility on the subject, by his mode of stating it. The last passage is part of a paragraph that begins with charging Henry with falsely pretending that a religious scruple actuated him against Katharine's marriage. Pole seriously commences this charge with saying, it was *revealed* to him from heaven that this was a false pretence: 'Mihi a Deo revelatum esse.' But in his very next sentence he convicts himself of a falsehood in this assertion, and utters what we should call derangement in any existing writer: 'But in what manner did God reveal this to me? not, indeed, by himself as he has often done many things to many, but by that very adulteress whom thou brought into thy wife's bed.' p. 266. Thus this asserted revelation from heaven sinks down into an assertion of information from Anne Boleyn. But did Anne Boleyn really tell him so? no such a thing. For instead of affirming it to be so, he shifts it away into another contradiction: 'I say that she laid open all thy mind to me. How? sayest thou. I will tell thee, if thou wilt first answer me the things I am going to ask thee.' p. 266. He then makes the charge about the sister, and the application to the pope, and adds this nullification of the whole: 'Did she not then herself, most plainly show what thy mind was. Did not God by her person, *she being silent*, make it certain to all that thou talkedst of the law that thou might obey thy appetite, not thy divine command.' p. 267.

"Thus he first says, that heaven revealed this to him; then, that it did not reveal it, but that Anne Boleyn told him. Then that Anne never said a word to him on the subject, but that heaven had made it certain

to him by the application for the papal dispensation. If this be not aberration of mind, I can only say it is an incomprehensible mystification. But that any person of common sense or equity should repeat such a charge on such an authority, only shows how gratified some minds allow themselves to be with another's defamation."—vol. ii. pp. 431, 432.

To this statement we will not add more than a single question. Is the revival of a charge imputing such complicated infamy and guilt to two innocent women, without a hint that it is open even to suspicion, consistent with the pretensions of an author, who talks loudly of "fidelity and research," and professes "to take nothing upon credit," and "TO DISTRUST THE STATEMENTS OF PARTIAL AND INTERESTED WRITERS?"*

"Anne," continues Dr. Lingard, still reasoning upon his false assumption, "had derived a useful lesson from the fate of her sister Mary. She *artfully* kept her lover in suspense; but tempered her resistance with so many blandishments, that his hopes, though repeatedly disappointed, were never totally extinguished." In opposition to this imaginary picture of finished coquetry, let us turn to a contemporary account brought forward by Mr. Turner.

"According to the account believed at the time, and transmitted to us by one of her adversaries, and therefore more credible, on Henry's first solicitations, she fell on her knees and made this answer: 'I think, most noble and worthy king! your majesty speaks these words in mirth to prove me, without intent of defiling of your princely self. Therefore, to ease you of that labour in asking me any such question hereafter, I beseech your highness most earnestly, if you do not rest, to take this my answer, which I speak from the depth of my soul, in good part. Most noble king! I will rather lose my life than my virtue, which shall be the greatest and the best part of the dowry that I shall bring my husband.' He met these sentiments with a declaration that he should not abandon hope—a natural feeling to one possessed of his splendid advantages, and daily conscious of their possession. Her reply was as creditable to her good sense, as to the spirit of true honour which was influencing her mind: 'I understand not, most mighty king, how you should retain any such hope. Your wife I cannot be, both in respect of my own unworthiness, and also because you have a queen already; and your strumpet I will not be.'"—vol. ii. pp. 195, 196.

The authority of the contemporary slanderers of Anne Boleyn is adopted or neglected by her later traducers as best suits their purpose. In one place we are presented with passages from Cardinal Pole declaratory of her innocence, *Concubina enim tua fieri, pudica mulier nolebat; uxor volebat.—Illa, cujus amore Rex deperibat, pertinacissimè negabat sui corporis potestatem, nisi matrimonio conjunctam, se illi unquam facere.* In another place we are told, by Dr. Lingard himself, that "five years had now rolled

* Lingard, *Advertisement* to vol. iv. 4to.

away since Henry had first solicited a Divorce; three since *he had begun to cohabit with Anne Boleyn.*" But the defence of her maiden honour may be safely left to Mr. Turner, who has supported it ably and conclusively—not so her remaining Tragedy. His impressions respecting the charges which brought her to the block, appear to be in her favour, and he adduces many facts by which these impressions are strengthened: but well aware that if she is once proved innocent, there is no longer any chance for her murderer, he never permits either his impressions or his evidence to produce their full effect upon his judgment. We shall put together a few of the contradictory passages which exhibit his perplexity.

From an extract of the Commission of her Trial, among the Birch MSS. in the British Museum, (4293,) Mr. Turner thus states the charges against her and comments upon them.

"These were, that she had affected several of the king's daily servants, and by base colloquies, kisses, touches, gifts and other incitations, procured their intimacy. The dates they found, have the suspicious appearance of being placed far back, and at distance from each other; whereas actual profligacy is more likely to have been recent and frequent. Thus, as to Norris; on 6th October, 1533, the '*dulcibus verbis, osculis, tactibus,*' are stated, and on the 12th the offence. As to Brereton, the allurements are dated 5th December, 1533, and the crime the 8th, at Hampton Court. As to Sir Francis Weston, the incitation is put the 8th May, 1534, and the fact on the 20th. As to Mark Smeeton, one of the grooms of the chamber, the invitation is on the 2d April, 1535, and the transgression the 26th. And as to her brother, the dates are 2d and 5th November, 1536. MS. *ib.* That her offences should be with four of her daily attendants, and yet be only specified to have occurred twice in 1533, once in 1534, and once in 1535, four times only in three years, and therefore no repetition with Norris and Brereton, in the last three years, nor with Weston for two years, nor with Smeeton in the preceding twelve months, and none at all in the last five months of her reign:—these circumstances do not resemble those of a true case, nor suit the natural conduct of a shameless woman. I have more doubt of her criminality since I met with this specifying record, than I had before. The regular distinctions between the days of allurement and the days of offence are very like the made up facts of a fabricated accusation."—vol. ii. p. 444, n.

"They who saw and heard her defence," he continues, "judged her innocent."—"The Lord Mayor afterwards remarked to some of his friends, that he could not observe any thing in the proceedings against her, but that they were resolved to seek occasion to get rid of her."—The out-door rumour was, that she had cleared herself; and her acquittal was expected. He dismisses the foul accusation of incest with just indignation; and yet it was upon

this accusation that Lord Rochford was condemned and suffered. The following nice balance of probabilities concludes his summary:—

“ Anne Boleyn has, on the whole, been severely dealt with by many, and even by some of her own sex—pardonably indeed by them; because female virtue is so beautiful in itself; every instance of it in elevated rank is so honourable to womanhood; its courtly models were then so rare; its purity at all times is so delicate; its reputation so precious; its value so inestimable; and its abandonment by any so depreciating to all, that we can easily forgive the female sensibility which will not pardon the offenders who break or weaken a talisman which makes their sex so attractive, so superior, and so subduing; but yet candour is bound to recollect, that this lady was outrageously attacked before her nuptial fidelity was suspected, merely because she was Henry's queen; that the partizans of the old system were deeply interested to depose and disgrace her; that his mutability was giving her enemies an assisting opportunity; that though her splendid prosperity was making her careless and presuming, yet indecorous freedoms are not actual vice; that female politics have sometimes attempted to revive decaying regard by exciting jealousy: that many have been precipitately, and some in all ages most unjustly accused; and that if appearances justify suspicion, they do not prove the commission of criminality. Nothing indeed can be allowed to excuse that offence, which blights the sweetest confidence of human society, and undermines one of its most upholding pillars. But before we throw down Anne Boleyn among the worthless of her sex, we must not forget that while we have her indictment and her conviction, we have none of the evidence by which we can ourselves appreciate the justice of either; and one authority, impressive because coming from a foreigner, who must have been guilty of wilful and gratuitous mendacity, if his assertion be false, has transmitted to us the assurance, from many Englishmen, that Henry himself, as he approached his own death-bed, expressed regrets for his severity against her. But as the destruction of the papers which detailed her trial precludes the attainment now of any greater certainty on the subject, than these pages have exhibited, the mind that wishes to be impartial after reviewing all the circumstances that have reached us, will perhaps incline to think that a state of academical neutrality as to her guilt, is preferable to either a belief or a denial of its existence; admitting at the same time that she may have been an instance of the justness of Ganganelli's remark, that the virtues in some persons are too often but like flashes of lightning, which shine and disappear in the horizon they illuminate. If Polydore Vergil believed her guilty, Melancthon hesitated to think so. That Smeeton should plead guilty; and that two grand juries of gentlemen of different counties should have seen evidence enough on one side to put the four individuals, who had no privilege of peerage, on their trials; that a common jury of another class of persons, on hearing the whole case, should have given their verdict of conviction on such an arraignment; and that the House of Lords, the highest order of subjects in the nation, should attain her also on the same charge and

circumstances—present such a concurrence of judgments upon oath and honour, of both the nobility, gentry, and others of the land, as to compel us, however unwilling, to hesitate before we can discredit what they united to think was sufficiently proved. But at the same time when we recollect on the other hand, the absence of such direct proof as would have satisfied bystanders, and precluded doubt; the improbability that she would have risked the forfeiture of such exalted rank; the constancy of her previous virtue, during six years severe probation; the king's jealousy of his honour, and certain indignation; the peril of the crime; the continual probability of its detection; her searching examinations adding no discovery; her solemn denials; her exculpation by Norris; her courageous death; her general good conduct; and her public character;—the balance fluctuates as we hold it; judgment pauses, and every honourable feeling seems to urge us to leave the question in that charitable uncertainty with which time, accidents, and history have combined to involve it.”—vol. ii. pp. 457—460.

And yet, after resolving to continue in this “charitable uncertainty,” (and be it remembered that *uncertainty* concerning a woman's honour is always destructive of it,) he writes in a subsequent page that Henry's *affections* and *virtuous disposition* led him to place his private happiness in marriage; that he was not in truth, as he has been described, “the nursery Blue Beard both of the throne and the nuptial state;” that “accident not malignity brought the ascription of this character upon him,” for that his *second* and fifth wives “*disgraced themselves and produced their own destruction.*”

But enough of this anility. Our limits will not permit us to abridge the strong presumptive evidence which Mr. Turner produces in proof that Pole's reluctance to accept the Cardinal's Hat, arose from his secret and long cherished hope of obtaining a more splendid prize, the English Crown. But we must not omit one important correction, which is furnished of Dr. Lingard's counter hypothesis. That writer attributes Pole's tardiness to a strong desire to avoid the resentment with which he knew that Henry would receive the information of his preferment by the Papal Court. Yet Dr. Lingard could not possibly be ignorant that this supposition must fall to the ground, on a comparison of dates. It was not until the 22d of December, 1535, that Pole was invested with the dignity of the Cardinalship; and so little regard had he for the resentment of his Cousin, that already, in the previous Spring, he had written and *circulated among his friends*, the most furious and defamatory invective against Henry, which ever issued from the armoury of Polemics.

Look now again upon the different pictures with which we are presented of Pole's Legations. Dr. Lingard remarks, “*It has been said* that, in accepting this mission, he sought to induce the

Emperor and the King of France to make war upon Henry, and that he even indulged a hope of being able to obtain the Crown for himself as a descendant of the House of York. *These charges are satisfactorily refuted by his official and confidential correspondence:* but at the same time it is plain that one of his objects was to confirm, by his residence in Flanders, the attachment of the Northern Counties to the ancient Faith, to supply, if it were necessary, the leaders of the malcontents with money, and to obtain for them the favour and protection of the neighbouring powers." If Cardinal Pole's correspondence refutes the *on dits* noticed by Dr. Lingard in the commencement of the extract, it also refutes, for ought we see to the contrary, Dr. Lingard's own admissions in the conclusion of it; for we perceive little difference between the two, and indeed in a note a little onward, is something more to the same purpose; "Pole, to excuse his conduct in the legation, assures Edward VI. that his chief object was to induce those Princes (the Emperor and King of France,) to employ all their interest with Henry in favour of Religion: but acknowledges that he wished them, in case the King refused to listen to them as friends, to add menaces, and to interrupt the commerce with his subjects.—He might indeed have hoped that these measures would persuade or intimidate Henry; but he must also have known, that if they had been pursued, they would lead to discontent within the kingdom and war without: and that such results were contemplated by those who employed him."

Little more than that which Pole avows to have been his object was intended in our times, by Mr. Theobald Wolfe Tone—and if any doubt remain as to the moral or legal character of the act, we may clear it away by Mr. Turner's plainer statement:—

"That the elevation of Pole to the cardinal dignity was not meant to be a sinecure of compliment or an asylum of indolence, appears from the commands he received, to become immediately the instrument of treason, rebellion, and ingratitude, against his king and patron. The simple fact needs no epithets. The words of his biographer display the truth; and when that is clear, it is always most emphatic. 'A few days afterwards he was named legate, with orders to go into France and Flanders, to excite the Catholics, in England, to whom the emperor and the king of France had promised much favour.'"—vol. ii. p. 466, n.

"Pole sufficiently implies the business he meant to pursue on this mission; and at Liege, in his letter to the pope from Cambray, 18th May, 1537, after calling those who were against him in London 'the malignants,' he says, alluding to the insurrections, 'when I departed from Rome, the people were in tumults for the cause of religion, and had active and noble men their leaders. Nothing then seemed likely to give greater spirits to the people, than to hear that one of their own countrymen was coming with authority who would help their cause; nothing

would bring greater terror to their adversaries, nor more easily draw them to more equitable conditions.' *Poli. Epist.* p. 52. In another part, he mentions, that 'the insurrection of the people who favoured that cause, had been appeased, so that many were executed, and all their leaders in the king's power. I heard of its being put down when I came to Lyons.' *ib.* p. 51. After giving the reasons for his being recalled, he adds, as one on the other side for his staying; 'a quick departure would bring despair on these people who ought to be chiefly thought of, and the greatest security to the adversaries. If some one should watch perpetually for all opportunities in his regions, to be ready, as often as occasion should emerge, it would be the best thing for the church, and unless we would entirely lose that island, we must do so.' p. 53. 'Nothing is more fit than that some one should remain in their sight, by whose example, authority, and suasion, as occasion should present itself, one who would be ready not so much, 'tam verbo quam re,' to undergo all extremes in body, *they might be moved.*' *ib.* p. 54. On 21st August, 1537, he wrote to Contareni, from Liege, that the government of England was so odious, that nothing could be more infirm than its condition. *ib.* p. 88. Either this conduct was treason, or treason ceases to be such if it be done at the command or in favour of the pope."—vol. ii. p. 470, n.

It is by no means improbable, although there certainly is no proof in existence to this effect, that the different members of Pole's family who suffered in 1539, were really implicated in his treasons. But what is to be pleaded in behalf of that vindictive bloodthirstiness which brought to public execution, after an imprisonment of more than two years, his mother, the last scion of the noblest stock in England, a woman and a septuagenarian? Even Mr. Turner "*regrets*" this severity; Mr. Turner, who, in order to extenuate the guilt of the Tyrant, has pronounced that Fisher and More were traitors; and who has maintained that the latter, (whom he pronounces to have been something "between a Monk and a Voltaire,") but for the violence of his death, long since "would have sunk into oblivion, except as a punster, as a worthy pattern of domestic virtues, and as one who had been fond of Literature!"

Here we must close; for we cannot scarce trust ourselves to follow the panegyrical paragraphs on Henry. Mr. Turner thinks it is a pity that he did not learn that "mercy and magnanimity are the most substantial pillars of assaulted power;" "for besides the naturally disarming agencies of forgiving clemency, it links us with that potentiality whose alliance can impart irresistible security." He continues:—

"None of these severities were inflicted without the due legal authority. The verdicts of juries; the solemn judgment of the peers, or attainders by both houses of parliament on offences proved to its satisfaction; pronounced all the convictions, and pronounced the fatal sentence. Every

one was approved and sanctioned by the cabinet council of the government. The king is responsible only for adopting the harsh system; for not interposing his prerogative of mercy, and for signing the death warrants, which ordered the legal sentences to be put in force. He punished no one tyrannically, without trial or legal condemnation."—vol. ii. p. 518.

As if Henry was one whit less despotic than the Cæsars, or as if any Court dared acquit the victims whom he sent before it already bound for sacrifice!

In one sentence we heartily coincide, although perhaps we might have couched it in different words; that "it is mere vanity of phrase to represent him *as an Apollo Belvidere* of the throne." This perhaps will satisfy our readers. Mr. Turner's work is highly valuable on account of the materials and guideposts which it furnishes; and we heartily wish that before it descended from quarto to octavo, some judicious friend had recommended curtailment, and advised him to retain his facts, and suppress his reasonings.

ART. IX.—*Origines; or Remarks on the Origin of several Empires, States and Cities.* By the Right Honourable Sir William Drummond. Vol. III. Baldwin and Co. 1826. 12s.

THE appearance of this Third Volume reminds us that our Review of the two former was confined to one department of the learned Author's researches. We endeavoured to prove that etymology is not a safe guide to historical truth, even when we are well acquainted with the languages which we use for that purpose; and, consequently, that it must become extremely fallacious, in all cases where our knowledge does not keep pace with the conclusions which we attempt to found upon the slender basis of verbal analysis. There is no reason for concealing that the remark now made was suggested to us by certain unequivocal proofs that Sir William Drummond, in many instances, seemed disposed to push his arguments a great deal farther than his proficiency in Eastern tongues appeared to warrant. In short, we did not think it necessary to withhold our opinion that the etymological disquisitions were the least perfect, and the most unsatisfactory part of his work; deficient in grammatical accuracy in the detail, and not remarkable for logical precision in the application.

It was with much greater pleasure that we referred to the sounder learning which is displayed in such chapters of the

Origines as are devoted to Geography and Chronology. On these subjects Sir William has not written without due research; for which reason, we most willingly acknowledge that, though there are many points on which our conclusions may not exactly coincide with his, there is no topic discussed by him, in regard to dates, genealogies, and geographical boundaries, which does not call for that praise which is due to enlightened and persevering inquiry. In following his footsteps through these intricate fields of investigation, we shall not confine ourselves to the volume now before us; but taking in the scope of his whole work, and more especially as it respects chronological tenets, endeavour to make the reader acquainted with what is new in the *Origines*; wherein the Author differs from his predecessors; the evidence upon which he rests his principal opinions; and lastly, the validity and consistency of his general results.

We begin with the Assyrian Empire; the chronology of which occupies a considerable portion of the First Volume. In this arrangement, it is true, we do not exactly observe the order which Sir William has himself adopted; his first cares having been bestowed upon the history of the Babylonians, who, in point of fact, were an older nation than the descendants of Asshur. But it will be found, as we advance, that the annals of the more modern people comprehend those of the more ancient; for in this case, as in many others, we attain our object most securely by commencing our search in full light, and by gradually receding into ground where our footing necessarily becomes more uncertain and obscure.

In respect to the origin of the Assyrian monarchy, then, our most important testimony is derived from the writings of Moses; who in the tenth chapter of the Book of Genesis informs us, that Asshur went out of the land of Shinar "and builded Nineveh and the City Rehoboth, and Calah, and Resen between Nineveh and Calah." It is stated in the same record, that Babylon was already founded, and that Nimrod had even established there the beginning of a regular government on monarchical principles. But the sacred historian supplies us with no such facts as might enable us to trace the progress of society in those early times; to determine the genealogy of the several ruling families; or to ascertain the names of the kings who first governed those fine countries which are watered by the Tigris and Euphrates, the order of their succession, and the length of their reigns. The purposes of the inspired volume did not require so minute a narrative of mere secular events.

For such particulars we are chiefly indebted to Ctesias and Herodotus; the former of whom, having lived a great many years

at the court of Artaxerxes Mnemon, had access to the archives of the Persian empire; from which he copied a list of all the sovereigns who had reigned over western Asia, from the foundation of the monarchy down to the conquests of Cyrus. His catalogues have been preserved in the volumes of Eusebius and of Georgius Syncellus; according to which the duration of the Assyrian kingdom varies from 1300 to 1360, and even 1460 years. Herodotus, on the other hand, asserts that the Assyrian power had not been established in Upper Asia more than 520 years at the time when it was dissolved or weakened by the rebellion of Arbaces the Mede. Let it be remarked, however, in passing, that Herodotus does not maintain that the empire of the Assyrians had no existence at an earlier period than 520 years before its dissolution, but merely that its dominion did not sooner extend itself over the Upper Asia. Viewed in the light of this obvious distinction, the narrative of Herodotus will not appear inconsistent with the chronological lists of Ctesias.

But most of those who have written on this subject, whether in France or England, have chosen to take part with one of those ancient authors against the other, and even to represent their conclusions as incompatible and contradictory. Hence it has been customary to rally round the standard of Ctesias or of Herodotus, according to the bearings of the several hypotheses which, from time to time, have risen into favour among the learned; and, particularly since the days of Marsham and Newton, who, it is well known, exerted all the power of their erudition and genius in support of the abbreviated system of chronology. In pursuance of this object, the former of these great men made a furious attack on the veracity of Ctesias, whom, on the authority of some ancient philosophers, he described as a weak, a credulous, an ignorant and a dishonest historian.

It cannot be denied that Aristotle, Pliny and Plutarch, did pronounce some very severe strictures on the writings of Ctesias, and accuse him of such imbecility, or easiness of belief, as could not fail to render his works altogether undeserving of credit. But it ought to be observed, at the same time, that the remarks of those profound thinkers applied only to the historical compositions of Ctesias, and particularly to a treatise of this kind on India, which is said to have contained many fabulous recitals. He had lent his ear too readily to stories of monsters, and of wonderful exploits, and therefore drew down upon himself the contempt of these distinguished naturalists and elegant writers; but it does not appear that they ever called in question his fidelity as a chronologist, or threw out any suspicion against the integrity of his Assyrian Catalogues. Ctesias, when copying a list of

names, had no temptation to indulge his genius for the marvellous; on which account we may freely repose in him that confidence which his writings procured for him on the part of Diodorus Siculus, Julius Africanus, Eusebius and Syncellus.

The fall of the Assyrian empire is usually dated in the year 747 before the Christian era, when Sardanapalus was deprived of his life and throne: to ascertain, therefore, the period at which the first monarch began to reign, we have only to add 1300, 1360, or 1460 years to the epoch already determined. Let us assume 1300, the number generally preferred; which, added to 747, gives 2047, for the accession of Ninus, who is always placed at the top of the list of Assyrian rulers. Adopting, with Sir William Drummond, the computation of the Septuagint, the reign of Ninus will be found to have commenced more than 1100 years after the flood; an interval which, from its length, cannot but appear to be inconsistent with the Mosaical narrative, and the early formation of society in the plain of Shinar.

This consideration leads us to a point at issue between Sir William and some of the more ancient chronographers. Julius Africanus, for example, relates that two dynasties, consisting of thirteen princes, reigned at Babylon before Ninus ascended the throne of Assyria. The race of Belus or Nimrod terminated at the seventh generation; after which the throne of Chaldæa was occupied by an Arabian family, six of whom reigned in succession, until at length Babylonia was conquered by the Assyrian king already named; who, joining it to his dominions, extended his sceptre over all the provinces between the Euphrates and the Tigris. In a word, that there was a kingdom established at Babylon 400 or 500 years before the Assyrian empire was founded in the house of Ninus, is an opinion which was almost unanimously held by the learned, till about the end of the seventeenth century; when Sir John Marsham published his *Canon Chronicus*, and started doubts in regard to the accuracy of the Greek historians and chronologers.

The principal authorities, whose lights we must follow in this investigation, are Alexander Polyhistor and Africanus, who appear to have copied, from more ancient writers, the result of inquiries the date of which is lost in the darkness of a very remote antiquity. These two authors agree in respect to the number of kings who succeeded Nimrod at Babylon, though they differ somewhat as to the length of time which was occupied by their successive reigns. Alexander Polyhistor assigns to the first dynasty of Chaldæan monarchs a period only of 190 years, while Africanus and Syncellus extend it to 225. The Arabians, again, are represented by both as having held the throne 215 years, when

they were compelled to retire before the rising fortunes of the celebrated Ninus.

During those 440 years, in the course of which the strength and magnificence of the Babylonian monarchy must have grown to a considerable height, no mention is made by any one writer, sacred or profane, of the Assyrian kingdom or colony which was founded by Asshur at Nineveh, Rehoboth and Calah. But there is every reason to believe that the sources of its prosperity were neither less ample nor less constant than those which contributed to augment the parent state; for we find that, when Ninus did appear, he carried with him into the field a degree of power which at once enabled him to associate his name, in eastern annals, with the first rise of that ascendancy which the Assyrians so long maintained among the nations of Asia.

But Sir William Drummond denies that there was any Babylonian kingdom before the rise of the Assyrian power in the days of Ninus. He attempts to destroy all the evidence that exists for a Chaldæan monarchy between the times of Nimrod and Ninus, by adducing proof that the latter was the son of the former, and consequently that they lived in the same age. He does not, indeed, direct his reasoning against the historical positions maintained by Polyhistor, Eusebius, Africanus and Syncellus, respecting the ancient dynasties which are supposed to have ruled at Babylon. He takes no notice whatever of their opinions on this head; but, by undertaking to prove that Ninus was the immediate descendant and successor of the grandson of Ham, he manifests a desire to supersede the inquiry altogether, as either trifling or absurd, and thereby to obliterate from the page of history the proper monarchy of Nimrod, as well as the catalogue of sixteen or seventeen princes who followed him in the government of Babylon.

It is perfectly clear, he maintains, from the Book of Genesis, that Nimrod and Ninus were contemporaries; for Nineveh, which signifies the habitation of Nin or Ninus, was built in the time of Nimrod. This argument is far from being conclusive. From the incidental manner in which the foundation of Nineveh is alluded to by the sacred historian, we are not justified in determining the precise date at which it rose into the capital of an empire. Nothing more is stated in the text than that, at some period after the occupation of Babylon by Nimrod, a chief named Asshur went out of that country into a more northern district, in which were subsequently built no fewer than four considerable cities. It is not to be imagined that the head of a small body of colonists would at once resolve to employ the strength and patience of his followers in the very useless task of erecting

four large towns, for which there were no inhabitants. Most writers, accordingly, considering that the building of cities is the work of time, and not likely to be accomplished in the first moment of settlement by rude tribes who had to derive their subsistence from a large extent of uncultivated territory, have inferred from the inspired narrative nothing more particular than that Assyria was originally peopled by emigrants from Babylonia: and that their descendants erected certain large towns which, in the days of the Jewish Lawgiver, were celebrated among eastern nations for their strength and magnificence. Nor does it certainly follow that the name, by which Nineveh was known in the time of Moses, was the appellation given to it by its earliest founders. Nothing is more common than for cities to undergo a change of name, or a change of circumstances; wherefore, we reject the conclusion of Sir William Drummond in regard to the age of Ninus, and deny that he was the son or contemporary of Nimrod. The holy record, we maintain, does not assert that Ninus built Nineveh. On the contrary, we are assured by Moses that the capital of Assyria owed its foundation to an emigrant from Babylonia, whose name was Asshur; whence it is manifest that he who asserts Nimrod and Ninus to have been contemporaries, merely because a certain city was built by Asshur in the days of the former, is chargeable with a gross violation of logic.

Nor is Sir William more fortunate in the second attempt which he makes to rest his argument on the basis of Scripture. He concludes that Nimrod was the master of Assyria as well as of Babylonia, and that Ninus was his son and successor; "because," says he, "the prophet Micah calls Assyria the land of Nimrod." But whoever reads his Bible with attention will find that the prophet, so far from calling Assyria the land of Nimrod, makes a marked distinction between it and Babylonia; saying, "and they shall waste the land of Assyria with the sword, *and* the land of Nimrod, in the entrances thereof:" that is, according to the commenting of Leclerc, they shall subdue Assyria and Babylonia with arms—"armis domabunt Assyriam et Babyloniam." Indeed this passage of Micah has hitherto been quoted, as far as we know, only by those authors whose object it was to prove, that the monarchies of Babylon and Assyria were not only different in their origin, but that the former alone had ever acknowledged the authority of Nimrod. That the Hebrew language will not admit of the particle which is translated *and* being rendered by the word *even*, we are not prepared to deny; but that it has not been so rendered by the Septuagint, nor by any of the most approved critics in modern times, is well known to every biblical scholar. In truth, it is only those whose opinions coincide with the strange

notion of Bochart, that Asshur meant a country and not a man, who imagine that Nimrod, after founding Babylon, carried out a colony to plant Assyria.

The error into which Sir William has fallen, respecting the age of Ninus, leads him into another in regard to the time of Nimrod. This mighty hunter is described in Scripture as the grandson of Ham, the son of Noah; that is, as occupying a place in the third generation from the father of the renovated world. But as there is still extant good historical evidence for the fact that Ninus and Abraham were contemporaries, and as Sir William has satisfied himself that Ninus and Nimrod lived at the same time, it follows of course that Nimrod and Abraham must have been contemporaries,—a conclusion which, we have no hesitation to say, is equally inconsistent with the Bible, and with all the writings of profane antiquity.

That Ninus and Abraham were nearly of the same generation, and lived at the same period, is a truth which is established by the best historians and chronologers among the Greeks. Both of them flourished in the eleventh century after the flood. But where do we find any authority for postponing the era of Nimrod so long, and placing him a thousand years after his grandfather? To this question the ingenious author of the *Origines* answers as follows :

“ That Abraham and Nimrod were contemporaries is not contradicted by the Scriptures, and is affirmed by various writers, whose authority is of weight in such a question. This fact, then, is asserted by the authors of the *Gemara*, or commentary on the *Mishna*, by the author of the *Targum* on the *Pentateuch* ascribed to Jonathan, and by several eminent Rabbins of later date. The Arabians held a similar tradition : and the historians Achmedibn-Jusuf, Mahummed Mustapha, and Al-Grannabi, speak of the patriarch as contemporary with the tyrant and robber. The commentators on the *Koran* have indeed abundantly embroidered this tradition, as have done also the authors of the Persian books called *Malim* and *Sophi Ibrahim*. But while we reject this extravagant exaggeration, we may admit these authors to have been right in considering Abraham and Nimrod as contemporaries.”—*Origines*, vol. i. p. 98.

But had this learned orientalist called to mind the great difference in the two schemes of chronology pursued by the Jewish writers, and by himself respectively, he could not have ascribed to their opinion the weight which he has been pleased to give to it. According to the genealogical notion of the Hebrew Bible, which is adopted by the Rabbis, Abraham was born in the 292d year after the flood : whereas, agreeably to the computation of the Seventy, which is approved by Sir William, the son of Terah did not come into the world till the year 1070, reckoning from the

same point. It is very obvious, therefore, that though the authors of the *Gemara* and *Targum* might, in complete consistency with their chronological views, maintain that Abraham and Nimrod were contemporaries, the same opinion ought not to be held by a writer, who not only refuses to concur in the conclusions of their chronology, but even directly accuses them of diminishing to the extent of 700 years, the very period under consideration, that, namely, from the flood to the birth of Abraham.

Is there any one, then, who does not clearly perceive that Sir William Drummond has called in the aid of an auxiliary, with whom he does not hold one point in common? The Rabbis believe that Nimrod began to rule early in the second century of the new world, and that Abraham was born towards the close of the third; and as the life of man at that remote period usually exceeded 200 years, it was not unreasonable on their part to suppose that the latter had attained to some degree of maturity before the other was called away by death. But the distinguished archæologist whose work we are now examining, maintains that the progenitor of the Hebrews was not born before the end of the tenth century at the soonest: and yet he adduces the authority of the Jewish commentators in support of the opinion that this patriarch was contemporary with another personage, who, according to them, existed about 700 years before him. In short, to have rendered the testimony of the Rabbis of any use to his hypothesis, Sir William should first have shown that they agreed with him in adding 700 years to the period which elapsed between the flood and the nativity of the patriarch; for unless he meets them on this common ground, their authority not only goes for nothing, but actually places itself in direct opposition to the very point which, by means of it, he wishes to establish. None of the Rabbinical writers admit that the birth of Nimrod was delayed till 1,000 years after the universal deluge. The reader, therefore, who has bestowed upon these considerations the attention to which they lay claim, will hardly accede to the conclusion which the author founds upon his reasoning, namely, that the evidence which proves Nimrod, Ninus and Abraham to have been contemporaries, is too strong to be set aside.

But there is a further inconsistency in the opinion entertained by Sir William. If Nimrod did not live till the days of Abraham it will follow that the Babylonian monarchy, instead of being the first of the kingdoms which were established after the renovation of the human race, must have been posterior to Egypt and several others. The accomplished author himself allows that the state of society in the time of Abraham argues its long previous existence. Powerful kingdoms were already established; great cities

had been built; and regular armies had been maintained. Mankind already witnessed the pomp of courts and the luxury of individuals. Pharaoh appeared surrounded with his princes; Abimelech came attended by the captain of his host; and Abraham himself was rich in gold and silver, in tents, in flocks, and in herds.

If such was the condition of things in Egypt, and other countries at a comparatively great distance from the original seat of population, is it not extremely improbable that, in the plain of Shinar, and on the borders of the Euphrates and Tigris, no kingdom should have been formed, no cities built, and no courts established? There can be no doubt that Moses, in giving the history of Nimrod, meant to convey to his readers such knowledge as had reached his times, respecting the first institution of political authority and of regular government among the descendants of Noah. The beginning of regal power was at Babel: and the grandson of Ham is represented as the first sovereign who aspired to the prerogatives of an autocrat. Babylonia, besides, was known to the latest period of the Jewish state as *the land of Nimrod*; and it is, moreover, the general belief that the persons, who emigrated thence into Assyria, fled away from the face of a tyrant, and from the pressure of a threatened despotism which they could not otherwise avoid.

But, again, this same Nimrod, according to the author of the *Origines*, was a native of Egypt, the son of Neptune and Libya. He is said to have conducted a colony from that kingdom to Babylon, where he instituted an order of Priests called Chaldæans, who, like the priests of Egypt, were exempted from all tribute and service, and who, like them, were employed in the study of physic and astronomy. In this particular the son of Cush is identified with the Egyptian Belus, who, as we are informed by Diodorus Siculus, conducted a body of emigrants towards the East, and established a sort of college in the neighbourhood of the Euphrates: while the celebrated Danaus, his son or brother, was employed in increasing, by similar means, the inhabitants of Argos, one of the most ancient cities of Greece.

The only authority adduced for this singular commentary on the Mosaical narrative, is the circumstance mentioned, indeed, by several ancient historians, that Ninus, the first king of Assyria, was the son of a certain chief called Belus: and, as Sir William had previously established to his own satisfaction that Ninus was the son of Nimrod, it follows that the Egyptian Belus and Nimrod, the grandson of Ham, must have been the same person. But no one knows better than this learned author that as Belus, signifying lord or master, was a general title, it was applied to a

great number of individuals upon earth, and even to the solar orb in heaven. It became, in some form or other, the common appellation of every distinguished sovereign, and was also very frequently introduced into the names of those more obscure princes who had no other claims to notice than that they were descended from a royal lineage. Hence, it must be evident that Sir William Drummond is chargeable with undue haste in the inference which he draws from the use of a very common word; and, consequently, that there is no reason whatever for believing that Belus the Egyptian, who lived in the era of the Grecian commonwealths, was Nimrod the mighty hunter, the great grandson of Noah, and founder of the Babylonian monarchy.

We next find that this hero of antiquity, the giant, the robber, the tyrant, the apostate, was, according to our Author, king of Shinar in the days of Abraham, and, consequently, one of the three vassal sovereigns under Chedorlaomer, who were defeated by that patriarch. His words are :

“ as we know that Belus or Nimrod was king of Shinar, it seems evident, I think, that he was one of the kings defeated by Abraham, and that the orientalists are right in considering this prince as the contemporary of the patriarch.”

Such an opinion, it appears to us, carries its own refutation along with it. Be it remembered, in the first place, that the Orientalists did not consider Abraham as the contemporary of Nimrod; they only considered *Ninus* and Abraham as contemporaries; and it is solely because Sir William has chosen to maintain that Ninus was the son of Nimrod, that he finds it necessary to bring down this son of Cush 700 years later than his proper time. In the second place, there is not in ancient history, whether sacred or profane, the slightest evidence that Nimrod held his kingdom as a vassal of the Iranian monarch. Nor can we trace the most distant affinity between Amraphel, the chief of a small tribe on the borders of Arabia, and the formidable warrior, the beginning of whose power was at Babel, and who has left the greatness and terror of his name among all the nations of the East. In a word, this is one of the grossest perplexities in which Sir William has involved his system, by identifying Nimrod with Belus the father of Ninus.

As soon as an author departs from the straight line of historical truth, he finds himself surrounded with darkness and inconsistency. For example, the whole current of ancient testimony runs in favour of the opinion that Ninus conquered Babylonia and subjected it, as well as the adjacent provinces, to the Assyrian throne. There is scarcely a single writer of antiquity who does not concur in this statement. But Sir William Drummond,

who sees in Ninus only the son and natural successor of Nimrod, is forced to pronounce the conquest of Babylonia, by the Assyrian arms, a groundless fiction.

"We have seen," says he, "from the testimony of various authors, that Ninus was the son of Belus or Nimrod. The account, consequently, which is given by Diodorus Siculus, of the conquest of Babylon by Ninus, is utterly improbable, since the son, it is natural to suppose, would succeed to the dominions of the father. It is to Belus himself that we ought to ascribe this conquest: and there may be reason to think that the same prince obtained possession of the whole territory of Shinar, on agreeing to become a vassal to the Persian monarch" !!

Another glaring inconsistency between the system of the *Origines* and that of the inspired volume appears in a concession which the author of the former finds himself compelled to make; namely, that several dynasties may have governed at Babylon before the grandson of Ham was born.

"Africanus may be right," says he, "(for I adopt with him the chronology of the Seventy,) in asserting that two different dynasties had reigned over Chaldæa before the time of Ninus; but he is manifestly wrong in representing the first of these two dynasties as descended from Nimrod."

We have merely to ask, in reference to the opinion just stated, where is the authority to be found upon which any rational being can be expected to believe that two dynasties, including thirteen kings, could have ruled at Babylon before the days of Nimrod?

It does not, we think, admit of any reasonable controversy, that Babylon was the seat of a royal government many years before the establishment of the Assyrian empire under Ninus. We are not, indeed, thence to infer, that the prince now named was the first monarch of Assyria, or that the country which was planted by Asshur had not, in the course of several centuries, attained to a considerable degree of power. But it seems, notwithstanding, to be perfectly clear, that until Ninus extended his victorious arms into Babylonia, no paramount dominion was acknowledged in those extensive plains which are watered by the Euphrates and the Tigris. Down to that period, the land of Asshur and the land of Nimrod, it is very probable, presented each a small kingdom, consisting of several tribes or families; the heads of which had not yet resigned, into the hand of the general sovereign, the privileges of independent chiefs, and especially the right of making peace or war, whenever their particular interest might appear to be affected.

But it would be vain to conjecture what was the actual situation of the community which was governed by the successors of Asshur at Nineveh, during the period that the first Babylonian kingdom subsisted; or even to attempt to discover the reasons

why it did not sooner emerge from that obscurity which covers the origin of nations. Nor, though it would be easy to prove, that between Nimrod and Ninus there was an interval of several centuries, and also that a number of kings reigned at Babylon before the Assyrian colonists obtained that ascendancy which has raised their name to the highest place in the annals of ancient Asia, do we not take upon us to determine the exact extent of that interval, or the precise amount of the royal successions which filled it up. Some chronographers, on the authority of Africanus, Polyhistor, and Abydenus, have laboured to establish the existence of three dynasties at Babylon before the conquests of Ninus; while others, with Sir William Drummond, exercising a whimsical scepticism in regard to this part of ancient history, have pronounced the whole doubtful, and the last in particular, namely, the dynasty of the Cuthite Belus, to be nothing better than an idle tale.

Mr. Faber, in his laborious work on the Origin of Pagan Idolatry, acknowledges that six kings succeeded Nimrod, not at Babylon, but at Nineveh, before the commencement of the proper Assyrian empire; or at least, before the accession of the first of those sovereigns who compose the dynasty given by Ctesias, and which extends from Ninus to Thonas Concoleros. As to the Arabs, again, or second dynasty, he mentions that they effected no more than a temporary conquest of Chaldea alone; and that though they continued to occupy the country which they had overrun with their arms, during the long space of 215 years, yet, he maintains that, as the Assyrian empire had begun long before at Nineveh, under the auspices of Nimrod, the Arabian dynasty did not *succeed* the first kings, as Africanus and Polyhistor have recorded, but merely governed some conquered provinces at a distance from the capital. The dynasty of these seven princes, of course, preceded immediately the dynasty of the thirty-six Ninevite sovereigns who are mentioned by Ctesias. Those seven earliest kings, he adds, must have been Nimrod and his lineal descendants; while the thirty-six who compose the Ctesian catalogue, must either have sprung from a younger branch of the house of Nimrod, or must have been members of another Cuthite family, which ascended the throne upon the extinction or abdication of the royal house of the founder.

We have here introduced the opinions of Mr. Faber, because, in one respect, they approach to a coincidence with those of Sir William Drummond. Both these authors maintain that Nineveh was founded by Nimrod, and not by Asshur, or any prince of the Shemitic stem; and also that the first rulers of Assyria were descendants of the mighty hunter. But the rector of Long Newton

never allowed himself to imagine that Ninus was the son and immediate successor of Nimrod; and far less could he believe that these two personages were the contemporaries of Abraham. On the contrary, he divides the times of Nimrod and of the patriarch, by an interval of several hundred years.

Nothing, in fact, which rests upon the mere testimony of ancient history, can be plainer than that there were sovereigns at Babylon before it was reduced by the celebrated Ninus, whose name stands at the head of the Assyrian dynasty preserved by Ctesias. That this ambitious prince was indebted for the possession of Babylon to his victorious arms, and not to hereditary right, is distinctly stated by Diodorus Siculus: and as he was aided in his conquests by the king of the Arabians, there is the best ground for concluding that the second dynasty, described by Africanus, had already given place to a more powerful body of invaders; in other words, that the third dynasty, mentioned by Abydenus, Muribas, and Moses of Chorene, had expelled the second or Arabian, and taken their place. The Sicilian historian relates, that "Ninus, the king of the Assyrians, having called to his assistance the ruler of the Arabs, attacked, with a numerous army, those Babylonians who were nearest to his own territories. But, he adds, the Babylon which now is was not then founded. The country, however, contained several other cities of some consequence, whose inhabitants, unused to war and ignorant of the means of defence, were easily brought into subjection. Ninus having taken captive the king of the vanquished people with his children, forthwith put them to death."*

We have already alluded to the opinions of the illustrious Newton on this subject. The great mathematician, not finding in the more ancient books of the Old Testament any mention of the Assyrian monarchy, thought proper to maintain that it did not exist till between seven or eight centuries before the Christian era. Sir John Marsham, indeed, had dated its commencement at a period somewhat more remote: but his arguments were substantially the same with those which were afterwards employed by Sir Isaac, and by all who have adopted the views of the latter. It is manifest, however, that a conclusion, founded upon the mere silence of the Jewish Scriptures, which do not profess to give the history of any other nation, cannot be deemed satisfactory. As a proof of this, let it be noted that Egypt, a country with which the children of Israel were better acquainted than they could be at that time with any eastward of the Euphrates, is not once named

* 'Ο δ' ὄντων τῶν Αἰσχυρίων βασιλεὺς Νίνος τὸν δυναστεύοντα Ἀραβῶν παρακαλῶν ἐστρατεύετο μετὰ πολλῆς δυνάμεως ἐπὶ Βαβυλωνίους. κ. τ. λ.—*Diod. Sicul. lib. ii. c. 32.*

or alluded to, in the books of Judges and of Samuel, though these contain the annals of the Hebrew people during five hundred years. Would it not be unreasonable to pronounce that, because the land of the Pharaohs is not mentioned by the Israelitish chroniclers for more than five centuries, it had no existence during that long interval? The Grecian kingdoms and republics too, had in the meanwhile established their foundations, and even begun to awaken an interest along the western shores of Asia: but of these celebrated communities no trace is to be discovered in the earlier part of the sacred volume. The monarchies of India and of China are equally unnoticed in the Hebrew annals; but we are not thence to infer that no government was formed in the great eastern continent, until after the canon of Scripture was completed, or that civil society had made no progress in Europe before the captivity of Israel and Judah. The mere silence of the sacred page, therefore, is not to be held conclusive against the existence of the ancient Assyrian empire; and more especially when we are assured by a Pagan author, that during the very period to which our attention is now directed, the sovereigns of that country pursued a pacific policy, and sought not either to distinguish their reigns, or to extend their borders, by means of warlike expeditions.

Sir William Jones acknowledges that the omission in Scripture, of all notice relative to the Assyrian empire, till more than two centuries after the reign of David, had induced him to adopt the opinion of Newton, as to the recent origin of that powerful kingdom. But he informs us, that "it seemed unaccountably strange, that although Abraham had formed a regular monarchy in Egypt; although the kingdom of Yemen had just pretensions to a very high antiquity; although the Chinese, in the twelfth century before our era, had made approaches at least to the present form of their extensive dominion, and although we can hardly suppose the first Indian monarchs to have reigned less than three thousand years ago, yet Persia, the most delightful, the most compact, the most desirable country of them all, should have remained for so many ages unsettled and disunited."

As far as this argument is concerned, Assyria and Persia may be assumed as convertible terms; and the conclusion held by Sir William Jones, in regard to the latter, applies with at least equal cogency to the former. If, in the days of Abraham, there was a regular government in Egypt and in Palestine, there can be no doubt that society had already taken a similar form in the lands of Asshur and of Nimrod; on which account, we have no difficulty in rejecting the abbreviated scheme of Newton, and in

adopting the more extended computation of Hales, Faber, and Sir William Drummond.

The last of these authors, after examining the testimony of Diodorus, Justin, and Velleius Paterculus, expresses his conviction that, between Ninus and Sardanapalus, there ruled at Nineveh thirty-three sovereigns, whose joint reigns amounted to 1,104 years. But as, according to the chronographer, the Assyrian empire was founded by Belus, or Nimrod, the father of Ninus, who is said to have governed 72 years, the whole term of its duration will not be less than 1,176 years. Again, the same author reminds us that Nineveh was taken by the Medes under Arbaces 747 years before the Christian era; whence it follows, according to his calculation, that the Assyrian monarchy originated 1,923 years before the birth of our Saviour.

Now, if we take this result in connection with the vulgar chronology of the Hebrew Scriptures, the commencement of the reign of Belus will coincide with the year 425 after the flood; a period, we admit, which agrees very well with our notions respecting the beginnings of civil government among the descendants of Noah. But Sir William, rejecting the chronological method pursued by Usher and Lloyd, to whom the English reader owes the system of dates which is placed in the margin of the Bible, adopts the computation of the Septuagint; and hence, the reign of Belus or Nimrod must be understood to fall in the beginning of the thirtieth century after the flood. The accession of Ninus, being 72 years later, will come down towards the end of the century just specified: and in this way the author of the *Origines* will find himself involved in two difficulties; being called upon to explain, first, how the son of Cush could ascend the throne of Assyria twelve hundred years after the deluge, and next, how he and Ninus could be contemporary with Abraham, who, according to this hypothesis, must have been dead a century before the latter of these princes was born.

All this confusion arises from a determination on the part of Sir William, not to regard Nimrod as literally the grandson of Ham, but rather as a remote descendant of that patriarch; and hence it is that he places him in the days of Abraham, who, according to the very chronology which the baronet himself approves, did not live until five hundred years after the time when the mighty hunter planted his kingdom at Babel. The following paragraph will prove that we have given the true sense of the author:

“The departure of Abraham from Ur probably took place early in the reign of Belus; and we may accordingly suppose this monarch to have mounted the throne in the year 1923 before Christ. Augustin and

Jerom fix the duration of his reign at 65 years. Consequently Ninus, his son, did not begin to reign until the year 1858 before our era. I find, however, that according to Polyhistor, Euechios, as he calls Nimrod, reigned during four *Neroi*; but this is evidently an error for four *Saroi*, which would give 72 years for the reign of this monarch. In this case we must reckon the first year of Ninus for the year 1851 before Christ; and the authority of Polyhistor, upon this point, is preferable to that of the two fathers. But Nineveh was taken by the Medes under Arbaces, 747 years before the Christian era. Consequently 1,104 years elapsed from the commencement of the reign of Ninus to the dissolution of the Assyrian empire under Sardanapalus. If then we reckon 33 reigns after Belus, this calculation will give us at an average 33 years, and nearly six months, for each reign."—*Origines*, vol. i. p. 282.

The absurd consequences to which the hypothesis of this learned antiquary carries his readers, supply of themselves a sufficient ground of refutation. But, we must add, he has not even followed the usual path of historical testimony, relative to the number of reigns and the gross amount of their duration. According to Africanus and Syncellus, the list of sovereigns amounted to 36, and the term, from Ninus to Sardanapalus, to not less than 1,300 years. If then to 1,300 years, we add 747, the sum will be 2,047 years before Christ, for the date of Ninus's accession; and as Abraham, agreeably to the notation of the Septuagint, was born 1,070 years after the flood, or about 48 years before Ninus became the monarch of Assyria, it is manifest that they must have been contemporaries.

This result corresponds with a tradition which prevailed universally in the ancient world, that Ninus and the patriarch lived in the same age; and as it rests upon a computation which combines all the elements of historical knowledge which have reached our times, we may safely conclude that it is not far distant from the truth; the intelligent reader must, accordingly, have perceived that the radical error in the system of Sir Wm. Drummond is the identification of Nimrod with Belus the father of Ninus; for, proceeding upon this assumption, he finds it necessary to date the birth of the first of these personages several centuries too late, but still not late enough to coincide with the era of the great ancestor of the Hebrew people. In a word, Ninus is brought too far down, either to occupy the place in ancient history which is usually assigned to him, or to allow sufficient time between his accession and the capture of Nineveh, for the term at which the duration of the Assyrian empire is most commonly computed.

The author of the *Origines* has, however, avoided the groundless innovations of Dr. Gillies and of Dr. Hales, who fix the beginning of the proper Assyrian empire, about twelve centuries

before the birth of Christ: the latter of these chronologists, indeed, allows that a kingdom was formed at Nineveh about a thousand years sooner; but maintains, that its power passed away into the hands of the Persians, or of some other rival nation, and that during the long period now mentioned, no sovereign sat upon the throne of Ninus. After this interregnum of nearly two centuries, a new dynasty arose in the person of Ninus the second; who proved, we are told, an ambitious and successful warrior, and is supposed to have in reality performed many of the exploits which are ascribed by the oldest Greek writers, to his celebrated namesake, the husband of Semiramis. Dr. Gillies, on the other hand, does not condescend to admit that the Assyrian empire had assumed any form whatever, before the middle of the thirteenth century preceding the era of our faith. Combining the notions of Marsham and of Newton, reposing his chief confidence in the accuracy of Herodotus, he denies that there is any evidence in ancient history, whether sacred or profane, for the existence of the monarchy of Assyria at an earlier period than that which is indicated by the Grecian author just named.

We repeat that there is no authority whatever for the opinion now stated, except the observation already quoted from Herodotus, relative to the length of time that the Assyrians held the government of Upper Asia. Appian, no doubt, as well as Dionysius of Halicarnassus, have adopted the views, or repeated the words of that celebrated writer; but with this exception, we know not of any testimony on which to rest the conclusions of those authors, who place the beginning of the Assyrian monarchy at 1230 years before the epoch of redemption.

It is worthy of remark that, at the period indicated by this calculation, the judges bore rule over the children of Israel: and it is well known that the Assyrian power was not heard of in Judea, for several centuries afterwards. Thus, the very reasons which induced Newton to believe that there could have been no empire at Nineveh, until the days of Pul, apply with equal force to the times of the Hebrew Judges, and even of the first three kings of Israel: for in the Bible no mention is made of that power, until about 200 years after the reign of Solomon. There is no record applicable to the middle of the thirteenth century before Christ, which can in any respect authorize a chronologer to confer upon it the distinction of having given birth, or even a revival, to the kingdom of Ninus.

Now, upon a full review of all the circumstances attending the two cases, it appears less improbable that an ambitious prince should have overrun the central parts of Asia, twenty centuries

before the reign of Augustus, and finally employed his warriors in the erection of a city on the banks of the Tigris, than that a similar character, a thousand years afterwards, should have subdued the finest regions and most powerful nations of the world, and yet leave among his contemporaries no impression by which his progress might be traced. We shall inquire by and by into the soundness of the opinions entertained by Dr. Gillies respecting the situation of Nineveh, as well as in regard to the question whether there ever were in Assyria two cities which bore that name; meanwhile it may be asserted that the general current of history, not less than the actual condition of society in Syria and Mesopotamia, at the time when the kingly government commenced among the Hebrews, oppose an insuperable obstacle to our belief that the Assyrian empire could either have originated or received any considerable increase at so late a period. Syncellus relates that, in the time of Abraham, Ninus and Semiramis ruled over the whole of Asia: an exaggerated expression, no doubt, but which at least sufficiently marks the date of Assyrian power, according to the computation of the ancient chronologers. Cus-tantine Manasses has in like manner recorded in his annals, that Belus, the father of Ninus, was contemporary with the same patriarch, and was after his death respected and worshipped as a God, under the name of Chronus or Saturn. The authority of Plato also has been adduced in support of the same views. In the third book of his laws he asserts, that the people of Assyria governed a great part of Asia several ages before the Trojan war. A remark which at least makes known the tradition which prevailed on that subject in the learned world, four centuries prior to the Christian era.

We may, therefore, conclude that if there are difficulties in the chronological system, which assumes the greater antiquity of the Assyrian empire, there are not fewer in the hypothesis which leads us to seek its origin only 1230 years before the revelation of Christianity. If it appears unreasonable to suppose that the power of such a kingdom should, during so many centuries, have been confined on the west by the Syrian desert, there is certainly not less improbability in the opinion that, in the full tide of its youth and vigour, it should have restricted itself four or five hundred years to the same limits, and not even have attempted to extend its borders towards Egypt and the Mediterranean sea. In a word, the inactivity of the Assyrian kings, from the thirteenth to the eighth century before Christ, is more consistent with the supposed antiquity of their race, and with the soft and effeminate manners by which they were distinguished, than with the notion of a con-

quering dynasty, which had just started up to grasp the sceptre of Asia, and to reduce to the condition of vassals all tribes of the east, as well as of the west.

These remarks, we need not repeat, do not apply directly to the hypothesis of Sir William Drummond. He adopts, partially, the computation of the more ancient writers, who assign to the duration of the Assyrian power much wider limits; but, not having confidence in Julius Africanus and Syncellus, he does not go sufficiently far back, and hence his conclusion does not harmonize with the facts with which he has thought proper to connect it. In a word, there is not, between the scheme of Newton and that of the old chronographers, any middle position which can be occupied with certainty; and it is in the attempt to create such a point, that our author has missed the complete success which must otherwise have attended his labours.

Not finding it convenient, at present, to follow his steps through the intricacies of Egyptian chronology, we shall devote the remainder of this article to a review of his opinions on the site of ancient Nineveh.

That this great city did not stand on the eastern bank of the Tigris, opposite to Mosul, but that it occupied the space between the Tigris and the Zab, or Lycus, is, he thinks, rendered manifest by the following considerations:

“The plain which lies on the eastern side of the Tigris, directly opposite to Mosul, is, by the admission of Major Rennell, only five miles in breadth. This could not, therefore, have been the site of Nineveh, if Diodorus be correct in stating the width of that city at ninety stadia.

“It appears clear from the sacred writings, that Nineveh was surrounded with rivers. ‘The gates of the rivers shall be opened.—Nineveh is of old like a pool of water.—Draw thee waters for the siege.—I will make Nineveh a desolation, dry like a desert.—Art thou better than No Amon, that was situate among the the rivers?’ These citations, and especially the last, says Sir William, could scarcely have been applicable to Nineveh, if that city had been opposite to Mosul; but they become perfectly appropriate, if the Assyrian capital were situated immediately above the confluence of the Tigris and the Lycus.

“According to Diodorus Siculus, there were mountains at the distance of 70 stadia from Nineveh, and plains intervened between these mountains and the city. But how shall we call the country between Mosul and the mountains on the opposite side of the river, a plain country, when Mr. Howel compares the appearance of it to that which is presented to the inhabitants of London by the high grounds of Highgate and Hampstead? Niebuhr tells us distinctly, that the pretended ramparts of Nineveh were really natural hills. But even if this were a plain country, it is only four miles broad. Now, according to Diodorus, the city, at least in one part of it, was more than seven miles broad; and the

plains beyond it, and between it and the mountains, extended near six miles. If Diodorus be right, Nineveh could not be situated where the inhabitants of Mosul represented it to have been placed.

"If we believe Diodorus, the Medes only obtained possession of Nineveh because the river had thrown down the wall to an extent of twenty stadia. It was an ancient tradition, says the same historian, that Nineveh could not be taken unless the river first became hostile to the city. Now from the representation which Niebuhr gives of Kalla Nunia, it seems difficult to imagine how the Tigris could have risen, at that place, so high above its eastern bank as to have thrown down walls of the strength which we must attribute to those of Nineveh. If, however, we suppose this city to have been situated near the confluence of the Tigris and the Lycus, we can more easily understand, how such an effect might have been produced, because when these two rivers are in flood, their waters will of course inundate the low parts of the country which lie between them. It appears that all the grounds on the west side of the Lycus, and contiguous to that river, are flat, and consequently are liable to be inundated. Thus we can easily understand how the walls of Nineveh, even to the extent of 20 stadia, may have been thrown down by the Lycus, before its struggling waters, swollen to unusual magnitude, perhaps by the melting of the snow, could force their way into the channel of the Tigris, when that stream might be equally raised above its usual level.

"I have already observed, that the ground where I suppose Nineveh to have stood, was low and flat in some parts, and especially on the side next the Lycus, while it was hilly and uneven in others. The walls of the city were washed by the Tigris on the west side, and by the Lycus on the east side. Two smaller streams must have flowed through the middle of the city, if we can trust to the accounts of travellers, or indeed to Rennell's map, though he has diverted one of these torrents into the Tigris, where a mountain, or at least some very high ground, seems to oppose its passage. Thus, according to the words of the sacred writer, Nineveh, like Amon-No, 'was situate among the rivers,' and 'had the waters round about it.' If we suppose Nineveh to have stood opposite to Mosul, we shall in vain attempt to explain the language of the prophet."

We have given the argument of Sir William at considerable length, and without leaving out any part which could materially strengthen his hypothesis. The objections to his conclusion are as follows :

1. There are no traces of such a city as Nineveh to be discovered in the tract of ground between the Tigris and the Zab, where our author supposes the capital of Assyria to have stood. Perishable as were the materials of which the cities of that alluvial territory were composed, we cannot believe that such a mass of building as Nineveh could have so entirely disappeared as to leave not a single tower or mound behind, to enable the traveller to

mark its boundaries, or collect some evidence of its ancient grandeur. Of Babylon itself, the destruction of which was not less complete than that of the older Assyrian capital, there are still some tokens remaining, whence we can determine the locality which it occupied, and even the extent of its more prominent buildings; but at the confluence of the Tigris and its tributary stream, the Lycus or Zab, there is neither wall, nor pillar, nor statute, nor inscription, to identify the dwelling of the powerful descendants of Ninus.

Now, on the supposed site of Nineveh, opposite to Mosul, there are even at the present day many unequivocal indications of a great city having spread its streets and palaces over the adjacent country. Mr. Rich, who inspected the ruins of Kalla Nunia, relates in his valuable Memoir on Babylon, several particulars which remove all doubt as to the fact that there must have existed on that spot a very large town, with the usual accompaniment of fortifications and public edifices. Alluding to the monument of Ninus, which is described as having been of a very durable form, he assures us "that the remains of it are still to be seen among traces which yet exist of the ancient Nineveh. He observed an inclosure of a rectangular shape, surrounded with an embankment of earth, having on it, at certain distances, mounds or towers of considerable size and solidity. The area, he remarks, is too small to have contained a town larger than Mosul, but it may be supposed to answer to the palace of Nineveh. The first of the mounds forms the south-west angle; and on it is built the village of Nebbi Yunus, where they show the tomb of the prophet Jonas, much revered by the Mahometans. The next, and largest of all, is the one which may be supposed to be the monument of Ninus. The form is that of a truncated pyramid, with regular steep sides and a flat top; it is composed, as I ascertained from some excavations, of stones and earth, the latter predominating sufficiently to admit of the summit being cultivated by the inhabitants of the village of Koyunjuk, which is built upon it at the northern extremity. The only means I had, at the time I visited it, of ascertaining its dimensions, was by a cord which I procured from Mosul. This gave 178 feet for the greatest height, 1,850 feet the length of the summit east and west, and 1,147 for its breadth, north and south. The other mounds, on the boundary wall, offer nothing worthy of remark. Out of one on the north side was dug, a short time ago, an immense block of stone, on which were sculptured the figures of men and animals. So remarkable was this fragment of antiquity, that even Turkish apathy was roused, and the Pasha and most of the principal people of Mosul went

out to see it. One of the spectators particularly recollected, among the sculptures of this stone, the figure of a man on horse-back, with a long lance in his hand, followed by a great many others on foot. Cylinders, like those of Babylon, and other antiques, are occasionally found here, but I have never seen or heard of inscriptions. It is very likely that a considerable part of Mosul, at least of the public works, was constructed with the materials found at Nineveh. Koyunjuk Tepè has been dug into in some places in search of them; and to this day, stones of very large dimensions, which sufficiently attest their high antiquity, were found at the foot of the mound which forms the boundary."—*Second Memoir on Babylon*, p. 39.

These facts are deserving of no small degree of attention; and in the absence of all similar evidence for the existence of such a city elsewhere, they tend greatly to confirm the tradition which prevails in the eastern world, that Nineveh stood opposite to the modern Mosul.

2. Sir William Drummond himself admits, that the authority of oriental writers, such as Edrissi, Benjamin Judæus, and Haico the Armenian, is decidedly hostile to his conclusions. He attempts to diminish the weight of their opinions by reminding us that they are not agreed among themselves, as to the precise site of Nineveh; but he admits, at the same time, that their legends imposed so much on the cruel and victorious Timur Lang, that after having sacked the city, he built a magnificent mosque over the reputed tomb of the prophet Jonah. Could Sir William quote as much historical testimony in support of his opinion, that Nineveh was built near the junction of the Zab and the Tigris; or could he show that any public act was ever performed with a reference to that belief; or that travellers went thither in search of antiquities, and found the remains of monuments, and sculptured stones, and extensive embankments, we should be more willing to allow that his reasonings were conclusive, and his hypothesis well founded.

3. The same remarks may be made in regard to tradition, which has all along pointed to the spot where Kulla Nunia now stands, as being the site of ancient Nineveh. Sir William, indeed, asserts that

"the time is past, when conjecture, appealing to legendary tales, could give the lie to probability; and when fiction, wearing the veil of antiquity, could escape the detection of criticism. Credulity, he adds, has been taught some useful lessons on the plain of Troy, where travellers, deceived by local traditions, long mistook the ruins of Alexandria Troas for those of ancient Ilium. Perhaps the day is not distant, he concludes,

when antiquarians will acknowledge that they have been as much in error about the site of the city of Ninus, as they once were about that of the Pergamus of Homer."—*Origines*, i. 203.

We agree with the author generally, as to the caution with which the voice of tradition should be heard and interpreted, whether speaking to us through the medium of poetry, or through that of historical narrative. But tradition has always some basis in truth; on which account we are disposed to ascribe to the hereditary belief of the Asiatics, respecting Nineveh, a degree of importance which prevents us, at least, from adopting the hypothesis which is now recommended to us with so much zeal and learning.

The reader who takes any interest in such inquiries, may not be displeased to be reminded that Dr. Gillies, the historian of Greece, places Nineveh in the Babylonian plain, between the Euphrates and the Tigris. But as his great city has likewise "totally disappeared," and left neither ruin, nor record, nor tradition behind, it must be ranked with those aerial creations which ingenious men have so frequently produced in the absence of fact and testimony.

We find nothing new in the tract inserted in the third volume of this work, "On the Origin of the Phenicians." It contains, no doubt, the usual share of learning, criticism, and hypothesis, which distinguish all the labours of this acute writer; but when we compare it with the essay of Bishop Cumberland, in his *Origines Gentium Antiquissimæ*, we discover that modern research has not succeeded in throwing any additional light over the obscurity of Sidonian genealogies.

Our opinion of Sir William Drummond's book is now fully before the public; and every competent judge, we think, will allow that we have bestowed upon his literary and antiquarian investigations, the attention to which, from their nature and objects, they may appear to have a just claim. It has given us pleasure to praise his industry and erudition; and respecting those points wherein his opinions were different from ours, we have always submitted our judgment with the feeling of diffidence which cannot but be suitable to a course of inquiry where the most learned men have arrived at opposite conclusions, and never without adducing the reasons and stating the evidence upon which our peculiar views are founded.

ART. X.—1. *A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Stow, at the Visitation in May, 1826.* By Henry Vincent Bayley, D. D. Archdeacon of Stow. Gainsborough. 1826. 8vo.

2. *The Principle of Ecclesiastical Order explained and enforced: A Sermon preached at a General Ordination in the Cathedral Church of Chester, on Sunday, July 9th, 1826.* By the Rev. James J. Hornby, M. A. Rector of Winwick. London. Rivingtons. 1826. 8vo.

It has been the pleasure of the Archdeacon of Stow, to limit his Charge, as nearly as possible, to a circulation of exact and prescribed diameter. He has not chosen to give it the free course of publication by sale, but to confine its publicity to distribution among friends. Whether his object was to place it beyond the limits of Critical Jurisdiction, we cannot divine. If it was, his purpose has been egregiously defeated. The Charge before us has been so widely circulated beyond the limits of his Archdeaconry, that, although it may have escaped what is *technically* called Publication, it has become much too notorious to claim the privilege of obscurity and privacy. It is “unknown and yet well known.”

We cannot easily imagine what it is that prompted the Archdeacon to this coyness and reserve. Perhaps he may have thought that observations addressed peculiarly to his own limited flock, had no claim on the attention of the Clerical body at large. Perhaps, too, he may have felt conscious of some little deviation from the general style and character of such performances. An Archdeaconal Charge is usually a very sedate and solemn sort of document: full of grave admonition and useful information; often breathing the spirit of mild wisdom and sober piety: but seldom distinguished by the loftier and more spirit-stirring graces of composition. Now here we have in ample measure the customary and more appropriate ingredients; and besides them, much that is rarely to be found in these official Addresses. We find in it elements that powerfully stir the affections, and give a livelier pulse to our hopes, and a keener vivacity to the sense of our duties. Like the Harp of David, it refreshes the Soul, and chases away the Evil Spirit of Dejection, from those, who may be appalled with fear of change and danger to the Church. Like the trumpet of the faithful Watchman,* it sounds throughout the bulwarks and fortresses of our Zion a warning note, which cries “sleep no more,” to all the guardians of her prosperity and honour.

* Ezek. xxxiii. 3.

It has long been our wish to submit to the public our views and opinions respecting some departments of Discipline of our Church, more especially with reference to its secondary and inferior officers. And it so happens that the Charge before us presents a detail of duties, which furnishes a fair opportunity for such animadversions as a body of Theological Critics may venture to offer.

The first thing, then, that struck us on perusal of this Charge, was the almost apologetic tone in which the Archdeacon thinks it necessary to speak of the Articles of Inquiry directed by him to the minister and officers of each parish. He takes very laudable pains to satisfy his Clergy that this mode of Inquisition is of high antiquity and authority, founded on the canons of Councils, the decrees of Pontiffs, and the dicta of holy Fathers. He thinks it more especially necessary to guard against the notion—which inexperience might possibly suggest—that he has been guilty of an illiberal innovation, in circulating, among other questions, an inquiry addressed to churchwardens, as to the life, character, and ministrations of the officiating clergyman. He very gravely affirms that, the insertion of this question is in strict conformity with immemorial practice. He further takes occasion very justly to remark, that it can convey no affront to any respectable minister; that no human virtue is strong enough to refuse the aid of subsidiary motives; and that they whose professional feeling is highest, will be just the very last to question “the utility of an inspection so authoritatively enjoined, and of a report so strictly demanded.”

Now to us, we confess, all this sounds very strange! There is something almost ominous in this anxious vindication of regular and traditional practices. It looks very much as if the venerable usages and laws of the Church had, somehow or other, been allowed to fall into partial desuetude and oblivion; as if her “strong statutes” had long stood “like forfeits in a barber’s shop, as much in mock as mark!” It looks as if “the book of Articles” had degenerated into such mere formality, that when an Archdeacon should venture to infuse some life and spirit into the almost dead letter of his Visitation-duties, his activity might, peradventure, excite some little surprize and reaction. In truth, the present race of Archdeacons is much to be commiserated, if their authority has come to them in a condition so dilapidated, as the above conciliatory expressions would seem to imply. If the most antient and unquestionable of their powers cannot be exercised, without the suspicion of making new experiments, it is high time that public opinion should come in, vigorously and decidedly, to their aid. And in order that it may do so, usefully and effectually, it

is important that the public mind should be rightly informed respecting the nature of their office.

We cannot help suspecting that the notions attached to this function have long been very imperfect and erroneous. People seem to have considered it merely as a sort of honorary distinction: as something which gave to the wearer, the title of Venerable; which assigned him precedence over a very large portion of his brethren; and enabled him to stand out, in bolder relief, from the general surface of the profession. But, till of late, it seems scarcely to have entered into many persons' heads, that any material and solid duties were connected with this distinguished rank in the Church; except, indeed, the arduous one of an annual meeting of this officer with the Clergy of his Archdeaconry, the exertion of his own lungs, and of their patience, by the delivery of a certain technical composition, usually known by the name of a Charge; and the final ceremony of adjourning with them from the Church to the Inn, to drink bad wine, and sometimes to hear bad speeches, till the hour of separation and relief should arrive. How such notions of this most ancient and important function should have prevailed so long and so generally, we cannot, very confidently, divine. One can hardly help apprehending, however, that about half a century ago, there must have existed a race of these venerable functionaries, quite alive to the honours and distinctions of their office; but as indifferent and as ill-informed about its powers and responsibilities as a large portion of the public appears to be at this moment: and that from them has descended the *damnosa hæreditas* which sometimes appears to defy the energies and resources of the most active of their successors. We hardly know on what other supposition to account for much of what we see and hear. Let any one, for instance, make a circuit of the villages, throughout a considerable portion of these realms, and what is the spectacle which in too many instances will salute his eyes on entering the Churchyard? On looking at the exterior of the Church, he will often find it half buried beneath the mould, which has been suffered to accumulate round it for ages, and to spread a gradual decay throughout the walls and the foundation. On entering it, he will find that every thing answers faithfully to the promise without; and that the external provision for perpetuating dampness and discomfort within, has succeeded to admiration. The walls will appear decorated with hangings of green; a carpeting of the same pattern often partially covers the floor; and the very first and last thoughts which are excited by the whole appearance of the building, are those of ague, catarrh, and rheumatism! Now

it is quite clear that the predominant wish of every one who goes into an edifice in such a condition as this, must be, to get out of it again, as soon as possible! And yet this is the state, we fear, of no inconsiderable proportion of those sacred places, which never should be approached but with hearts responding to the exclamations of the psalmist—"I was glad when they said unto me, let us go into the House of the Lord!" We ask, then, could these things have been so, if Archdeacons had, in all preceding times, felt and acted up to the true spirit of their office? And is it matter of wonder, if even in these days of comparative energy and vigilance, the inveterate evil should be found to contest the ground, inch by inch, against the most unwearied spirit of reform?

Of the nature of the Archdeacon's office we have a very brief and yet very complete exposition in the Charge before us:—

"The Archdeacon, on his part, is as solemnly pledged to the Bishop, to act in his stead, and on his behalf; to be his eye always, and often his hand—to view every corner of his province, and to detect and present unto him offences—to inquire generally of all things spiritual and temporal, appertaining to good order, within his jurisdiction—and to communicate whatever information he may obtain as to the state, conduct, and sufficiency of the Clergy. Further, it is his business, as immediate Ordinary, to visit every Parish Church and Glebe House, and to injoin proper reparations—to look after charitable bequests and endowments, the rights and property of the Fabric and Incumbent—and, lastly, to take care, as far as in him lies, that all the functions of the ministerial calling, all the duties of residence, and all the services of the liturgy, be legally and canonically performed."—*Bayley*, pp. 6, 7.

Now we trust that there is not to be found at this day an ecclesiastic, who could endure the thoughts of abandoning such momentous responsibilities as these. If ever there were persons who could be content to seek this office merely for its rank and dignity, and who could deliberately suffer parish churches and glebe houses to fall into decay for want of regular and effective visitation—we are persuaded that the race exists no longer. Indeed they would hardly be tolerated in an age, which, beyond all others that have gone before it, subjects public men to public inspection and censure. We repeat, therefore, that the mass of evil, which still cries out for a steady application of the Archdeacon's authority, must in a great measure be a legacy bequeathed to us by the ignorance or neglect of past generations. In some cases, indeed, it may be the result of peculiar and local circumstances, beyond the control of the individual; or it may have arisen in part from a defect in the powers belonging to this office, which from long disuse, or from the imperfection of the law, may be less

summary than could be desired. We trust, however, that a spirit is abroad, which shall overcome all difficulties, and shall gradually infuse new life and strength into this most essential department of ecclesiastical discipline.

If indeed, there should be now extant a solitary specimen of this sort of merely passive and representative Archdeacon—one who hath almost forgotten himself to silk and poplin—we should not be advocates for the dangerous process of tasking his energies too suddenly. We would not ask of him to explore the learning and antiquity connected with his interesting office. We would not require him to illustrate and adorn it by affluence of information and patience of research. We would simply refer him to the brief manual of his duties we have cited above. And we should do this in the full confidence that it must gradually awaken him to a sense of the obligations connected with his conspicuous station. A repeated perusal of it at prudent intervals of time would surely, at last, satisfy him of the inestimable benefit that must accrue to the Church from a faithful and vigilant discharge of these duties; and show him the tremendous chasm which must be occasioned by the abandonment or suspension of this department of ecclesiastical discipline.

We cannot, here, forbear to remark generally, that, whether in sacred matters or profane, a dissolution of the bond between high office and faithful service, is still more widely and more deeply calamitous than even the usual estimate of it might lead us to imagine. It is in truth a destructive and two-edged mischief. It not only lays waste the peculiar province of usefulness allotted to the individual; but it tends to spread the curse of sterility and desolation over every surrounding region. And on this account it is that public opinion should look forth upon the evil with an aspect of unsparing jealousy and sternness. When once this falling-sickness has invaded any arduous and extensive province of duty, it sends among the infected members a positive dread and hatred of activity. And if any of the fraternity, so affected, should exhibit unusual symptoms of health and vigour, immediately the eye of his brethren is evil towards him. They seem to regard him as a sort of dangerous *energumen*, haunted and agitated by the turbulent demon of reform. They look on him as an unresting Spirit, that wanders over *dry* places in search of repose, which he cannot find. And thus it is that the zeal and integrity of faithful men is too often stamped almost with the mark of insanity: till, under the withering influence of constant discouragement, there is an almost utter extinction and loss of that restorative and self-corrective power, which is necessary to preserve all institutions from decay.

We offer these remarks, however, purely in the spirit of precaution. We trust that their direct and pointed application is reserved for days indefinitely remote. We are supported and encouraged in this hope by our recent recollection of such men as Wollaston, and Sandford, and Jefferson; and by the living examples of a Goddard, a Bonney, and a Butler;* with other distinguished names, whose memorial will be blessed, and whose deeds will follow them. And we discern ample cause for thankfulness and encouragement in the general and "glad acclaim" with which the Charge before us has been received, almost throughout the clerical profession.

We are the less able to endure any reduction of efficacy in the office of Archdeacon, in the present age, because the Church has long been suffering from the partial extinction of another very ancient and useful function, that of the Rural Dean. This loss is bitterly lamented by the author, in common with every intelligent friend and guardian of the Establishment; and we trust that the complaint will be iterated and echoed till it has accomplished the general restoration of this office. It is possible, indeed, that even this sober and salutary reform may meet with cold looks from the few remaining patrons of quiet and comfortable degeneracy. But it is satisfactory to reflect, that such persons will find themselves destitute of their usual topics of ill-boding declamation. If they venture to speak of the difficulty of such revival, we have only to reply that in some dioceses, (as Exeter, St. David's, &c.) the office of Rural Dean still flourishes; that in most parts of Ireland it is in full vigour; that at Llandaff and Peterborough it has been re-established, with complete success by Bishop Marsh. The birds of darkness and evil omen, therefore, will blink and croak in vain, while the Church is renewing her strength like the eagle, and soaring upwards towards the source of light and life.

In p. 16, &c. we have a very strong and animated protest against the practice of administering Baptism in private houses. The Archdeacon complains that "the Sacrament which dedicates the child to his Redeemer, and pledges him to the Christian service, in the sight and amidst the prayers of the congregation, is perpetually thrust out of the temple, into the privacy of a chamber or a drawing-room." And he adds, that "the minister has *no right* thus to degrade a blessed ordinance into a beggarly ceremonial; to sink that sacred office, by which our infant names are enrolled in the Book of Life, into a business of parchment and

* Dr. Butler is Archdeacon of Derby, and Master of Shrewsbury School. His labours and his attainments have raised the school to the highest reputation; and his vacations (we are informed) are chiefly devoted to Parochial Visitations! Such conduct is above all praise. A single example like this is enough to banish despair.

parochial registration." He expresses his conviction, that no cause has been more perniciously effective in separating our people from us, or in "obliterating the feeling of Churchmanship among us." He condemns the notion, that the evil is too inveterate for cure; and, speaking experimentally, he feels assured that perseverance, kindness, and discretion, will gradually and certainly prevail against it.

This very reprehensible abuse of a most awful solemnity has, of late, been so strongly discountenanced in some distinguished quarters, that we are willing to hope that the original and canonical practice will, in the course of time, be at least partially restored;—we say partially, because even the public administration of baptism, according to the almost universal practice of the present day, is by no means conformed to the directions of the rubric. Those directions seem clearly to require that the baptismal service shall immediately follow the last lesson, either at morning or evening prayer, "as the Curate by his discretion shall appoint." And if this injunction were observed, the infant would, truly, be dedicated to his Redeemer *in the sight, and amid the prayers, of the congregation*. But it is now the general and notorious custom to postpone the Christenings till the afternoon prayer is over; and in that case *the congregation*, which is to witness the solemnity, is no better than a mere fiction, none being ever present at it but the minister, the clerk, and the parties, and sometimes a few stragglers. It is needless to dwell upon the various obstacles which, at this day, present themselves to a complete conformity with the rubric in this particular; especially in London and other very populous places. They are so formidable, that we can hardly see our way to the most hopeful method of subduing them. We cannot, however, but think that the occasional and frequent restoration of this service to its proper place would be cheaply purchased even by the sacrifice of the afternoon lecture; for we fully agree with the Archdeacon, that it is "of singular beauty and interest; and that, for the omission of it, no sermon can atone."—p. 17.

In the country, at least, the reform is surely practicable; and if it cannot be complete in large and populous parishes, it may still be an important step towards it if this blessed rite can be protected from desecration, and the administration of it strictly confined to the Church. Except in cases of absolute necessity, it ought, unquestionably, to take place within consecrated walls: it ought, moreover, to have the fullest character of publicity,—it should be performed on a spot accessible to all; if there be none assembled to witness it, there should, at least, be nothing to prevent or discourage their assembling; the open door of the

Church, on holydays as well as on the Sabbath, should seem to invite all, who may choose, to be present at the reception of a new member into the "congregation of Christ's flock."

The disuse of Catechizing is another subject of deep regret with the Archdeacon; and he asks how this comes to pass? whether from the fastidious impatience of the congregation, or from the haste of the minister, or from a low estimate of its value, or from a notion that its necessity is superseded? It is probable that all these causes may, in various degrees and proportions, have combined to produce this disastrous effect; but no one we think, in this part of the world, can hesitate to ascribe, chiefly, to the "impatience of the congregation" the discontinuance of this practice in the midst of the service. The prayers, the psalmody and the sermon together, occupy a very considerable time; and people are not very willing to have these services interrupted and protracted by the parenthetical performance of an office which, however momentous in itself, many will find intolerably wearisome on perpetual repetition. "The chair of the catechist of old," the Archdeacon observes, "was filled (occasionally) by the highest authorities, the finest talents, and the deepest learning:" and at this day, where catechetical instruction is administered by persons signally qualified for it by familiarity with the Scripture and knowledge of the human heart, it must be highly interesting. But it would be vain to hope for a general supply and constant succession of ministers thus eminently gifted: catechizing, therefore, in the congregations of the metropolis, though it can never cease to be in the highest degree useful and important, is never likely to be generally attractive, otherwise than as an exercise of rare and periodical occurrence. At the same time, we can imagine that, in the smaller and less refined audiences of a country Church, a small portion of the catechism, accurately and intelligently repeated, and followed by an explanatory sermon, may often be as interesting as it must be beneficial.

These considerations, however, can furnish no excuse whatever for the utter neglect of the canonical injunction, that the Vicar or Curate on every Sunday or holyday, *before Evening Prayer*, shall examine, instruct, and catechize the youth and ignorant persons of his parish. And even in those places where the disuse of the practice may be partially compensated by the establishment of an effective National or Sunday School, there is nothing to relieve the clergyman from the responsibility of vigilant personal superintendence over the progress of the pupils. Zeal and sincerity will always be able to preserve the spirit of the canon, even where a rigorous adherence to its letter may be inexpedient or impracticable; and this cannot fail to suggest that, according to the

genius of the English Church, the presence of the minister is the very life and soul of all religious instruction.

We are exceedingly concerned to perceive that the Archdeacon is by no means satisfied with the state of parochial psalmody within his jurisdiction. We sympathize very sincerely with the disturbance of spirit inflicted upon him by the provoking indolence or stupidity of his rustics; we were almost tempted, however, to forgive their vexatious inaptitude for melody, on finding that it drew forth from their Ordinary a most eloquent and affecting vindication of that sacred exercise: we cannot forbear the insertion of it entire.

“ The next question, to which an unfavourable answer has been given, relates to Psalmody. This at first sight may appear, but indeed it is not, a point of secondary moment. Inferior perhaps to the preceding in moral worth, it comes scarcely a whit behind it in moral influence. In all the contests and all the triumphs of the catholic cause they have been joined together—let them never be put asunder.

“ Surely there lives not a man who thinks scorn of this sacred and pleasant exercise. In every age and every clime, in all the changes and chances of life, it is the natural expression of religious gratitude, the appropriate language of the devotional spirit. It has been the pious recreation of the merry, the midnight solace of the captive, the animating farewell of the martyr. It has lent its aid to record the thanksgiving of the legislator and of the conqueror; to grace the marriage festival, and to consecrate the memory of the mighty fallen. It has been the employment of patriarchs and prophets, of priests and kings, of apostles and angels—yea, and of One, it should seem, higher far than cherubim and seraphim.

“ At the creation of man, the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy; at his redemption, the glad tidings were chaunted by a multitude of the heavenly host: and at the final consummation of his being, when every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, shall be summoned before the Creator, it may be that the spirits of just men made perfect shall be welcomed into the portals of the New Jerusalem by ‘ the harps of God,’ and by the voice of choral symphony—a voice as of many waters, a voice as of mighty thunderings. Called to see their Saviour face to face, and to serve him day and night, it may be that they shall join the innumerable company of angels, and sing the new song, saying, ‘ Blessing, honour, glory and power, unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever.’

“ But Psalmody has its glories and its uses in this world also. When the gospel was to be propagated, St. Paul well knew how to employ its instrumentality. Let the heathen, drunk with wine, celebrate aloud the triumphant revelries of idolatry; but his children in the faith, filled with the spirit, were to speak among themselves, to teach and admonish one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace,

and making melody in their hearts to the Lord. Hence we are told the early converts used to assemble together, and chaunt in alternate parts a hymn to Christ, as to a Deity. Again, when the gospel, long hid, was to be restored to us—when, rescued from the motley and meretricious disguisements of the Romish ceremonial, it was to shine forth afresh in all the pure and primitive beauty of holiness, the Reformers found in psalmody the most elevating of virtuous excitements, and the strongest bond of congregational union.

“Sacred music was a regular and splendid appointment of the Hebrew ritual; it is an original and essential part of the Liturgy; it is the very life and soul of every new method of dissenting worship. Why then is it so rarely invited to impart a solemn interest to our parochial services?—to shed abroad its blessed and joyous influences on our hearts and understandings? And yet no one can witness its absence without feeling that something is wanting to raise his thoughts, to kindle his affections, to sanctify his imagination, and to harmonize the whole man in the hour of devotion. Then does it not argue a want of taste, or rather, and still more, a want of zeal amongst us, my brethren, that whilst every conventicle is made to resound with hallelujahs, the courts of the Temple alone should ever fail to repeat the strains of the sweet Psalmist of Israel?—that, whilst all Creation, every thing that hath breath, is summoned by the voice of Nature and of Inspiration to sing praises unto the Lord, we only, the favoured sons of the Church, should at any time seem to maintain an ungracious or indolent silence?”—*Bayley*, p. 21-24.

It is melancholy enough to stoop from these raptures, and to alight once more upon this world of discord; and we know not that the contrast would be much softened, if our first visit, after our descent, should be to a village church, where it might be our lot to witness the pride of the rustic orchestra, and to listen to the groans of the bassoon, and the screechings of the violin, and the braying of the hautboy, and the uplifting of the stave, in the midst of noises fitted to raise commotion any where but in the heart, and which might sometimes be thought to represent the sufferings of unblest spirits, rather than the joys and transports of the just! The abandonment of parochial psalmody is bad enough; but really the coarse caricature of it we have occasionally been doomed to witness, appears to us decidedly worse. It never fails to remind us of the paintings we sometimes meet with, in which brawny saints, and sublunary looking seraphims, are portrayed as inflating their cheeks on wind-instruments of every imaginable calibre, or astride upon enormous bass-voils, which they appear to be scraping with truly carnal vigour and perseverance. Now, where an organ cannot be had, is it not better to trust wholly to the human voice? Truly, they of the Tabernacle seem to have a better understanding in these matters, than we of the Establishment! In this respect (perchance, too, in some others) they are wiser in their generation than the children of the Church. In-

strumental music they generally reject, and yet their psalmody often shows how advantageously it may be dispensed with. And surely it is difficult to imagine why any congregation of the Establishment should not accomplish what is achieved by every knot of Dissenters. The Archdeacon (with whom hope is ever predominant, and whose last look at every subject is always directed to the bright side of it)—the Archdeacon is quite confident that this defect in our worship admits, in a great degree, of an easy remedy.

“I take upon me to say, that in almost any parish, where there is room for a Sunday-school, this defect may in great measure, and easily, be supplied. A few weeks only of teaching, with moderate encouragement, will produce a choir, which, if it may not exactly satisfy the fastidious ear, will assuredly please the pious worshipper—will tend to unite all hearts and voices in the expression of one common feeling—and will relieve at once the minister and his audience.”—*Bayley*, p. 24.

We know not whether the Archdeacon is much in the habit of attending the London churches; we should rather suspect that he is not: for if he were, we apprehend that even his apparently sanguine temper would be a little dashed! With all the facilities for excellent psalmody—with powerful organs, numerous congregations, and often with a multitude of charity children, who want nothing but kind and steady care to mould them into a body of admirable choristers—with all these appliances and means at their command, they do, some of them, contrive to convert this joyous spiritual exercise into a positive physical infliction upon the whole assembly, those individuals only excepted whose ears are quite insatiable of noise. Some instances* unquestionably may be found in which the music and singing are under the management of a watchful minister, and of an able but unambitious organist, who makes a judicious selection of melodies, and trains the children to a soft and subdued style of execution; and then the effect is unspeakably soothing and delightful. But what would Dr. Bayley say if his senses were assailed, Sunday after Sunday, by the stormy roar of the organ, and the tumultuary “violence of song,” which express the “*awful mirth*” of many of our London places of worship? And how would his spirit be stirred within him, were he to hear, (as we have heard,) that while the Establishment is thus trifling with this sacred source of influence, there are actually persons in London who derive good incomes solely from the employment of teaching dissenting congregations to sing!

In the admonitory portion of the Charge, we find the duty of

* Of these the most remarkable, perhaps, is the present Bishop of Chester's Church of St. Botolph's, Bishopsgate; the psalmody of which is known to be an object of his Lordship's anxious and constant attention.

personal intercourse between the pastor and his flock described and enforced with great beauty and feeling; and such exhortations come with tenfold power from any one who combines in his own person official rank with the character of a working parish priest. That clergyman can be in no very enviable frame of mind, who can peruse this part of the Charge without feeling his heart burn within him. If his cure be in a country parish, the minister may find here an engaging picture of those blessed ministrations which enable an individual to carry round to every cottage within the circuit of his labours, the most sacred influences and heartfelt charities of the Gospel. If a city parish, with its thousands and its tens of thousands, be the scene of his exertions, he will look with many a sigh upon this delightful exhibition of duties, from which he is almost utterly cut off. He will be led to meditate sorrowfully on that strange effect of mixed and crowded populations, which often draws as impassable a line of separation between the minister and a large proportion of his people, as if they were kept asunder by a mighty gulf; and he will form many an earnest wish that some means could be devised for carrying the influence of the Church into all the recesses of that vast labyrinth—a large and densely peopled district.

It is impossible to look without compassion on the condition of a conscientious clergyman, planted in the midst of ten, or twenty, or, perhaps, thirty thousand people, whom the law is pleased to call his parishioners, and with the care of whose souls he has been solemnly charged. Even had he no other occupation under heaven, than to go about from house to house among them; and were he gifted with a burning zeal, and an energy that knows not weariness,—still years must elapse before he could make any sensible approach towards that sort of omnipresence which is requisite for the most effective discharge of pastoral duty. As it is, however, his attention is distracted, and his time often cut into fragments, by the incessant interruptions of the weekly routine, and by the vexatious intrusion of numberless little secularities which the law fixes upon him, and which in various shapes invade the sanctity of his spiritual engagements. In addition to these calls, he has to prepare himself for the awful business of addressing his people from the pulpit, on the concerns of immortality, once, or perhaps twice, in the course of each Sabbath—a work, for which alone the meditation and labour of a very large portion of the week would hardly be more than sufficient. Can it, then, be a subject of wonder that many of the private houses should remain unvisited? And when the Ordinary inquires, “Doth your minister visit the poor and sick readily and gladly?” can any other

answer be reasonably looked for, but that which is so frequently returned—that he doth so *when sent for*? And can we be surprised to find that the Dissenters are ready to step into the vacancy which the Church appears to have left, and that their emissaries should be found by the bed-side of the sick and dying, from which the solitary officiating minister is detained by the pressure and entanglement of other occupations? The Dissenter, be it remembered, has no funerals to perform, *or to wait for*; no marriages to solemnize; no register to keep or to search; no certificates to sign or to fill up. He has, therefore, full leisure to appear among the afflicted as the messenger of comfort, and thus, whether intentionally or not, to spread over a whole parish the unjust persuasion, that he alone is deserving of their confidence, and that the clergy are destitute of all proper care for the souls committed to their charge!

How this class of evils is to be remedied, it must be left for higher wisdom and influence than ours to decide. We cannot, however, persuade ourselves that ecclesiastical discipline and government is a system in its very nature so inflexible, that it refuses to mould itself to all the exigencies that may arise. We can scarcely believe that there is not, somewhere, the power to supply all the spiritual wants of the most crowded population. Would there be any thing adverse to the spirit of the Establishment, in the appointment of a subordinate class of ministers, who might discharge the offices of a sort of *brotherhood of charity*, and who, in that character, might go about among the people, and do, *for the Church*, that which the separatists are now doing, in a certain sense, in opposition to the Church? That some such agency as this is grievously needed in large city parishes, it is quite impossible to deny; and, if it cannot be supplied, it is to no purpose for us to shut our eyes against the obvious consequences, namely, that a most important department of spiritual ministration will continue to be performed by persons who disown our communion.

There is one topic which the Archdeacon has touched upon with most judicious delicacy, not in the text of his charge, but in the snug retirement of a note at the end of it; where the subject is alluded to, among sundry other matters, which he has contrived to introduce with a spirit of innocent, good-humoured pleasantry, fitted even to “smooth the raven down of” orthodoxy, “till it smiles.” The subject in question is that of field-sports, in all their variety, considered as forming part of the recreation of a divine.

“This, qui facillè intelligitur, non nominabitur, may not indeed have any thing in it of moral turpitude, any thing of personal impropriety.

Yet, if the use of it, from its very nature, be liable to degenerate into abuse—if, as experience proves, it too often become a ruling passion—if its excitement be seldom compatible with seriousness and composure of spirit—if it occupy time pledged to parochial business, or to the ‘daily reading and weighing of the Scriptures’—if it engross funds which might be better employed—and, lastly, if it give offence, as it is almost sure to do, to our people—if such be the case, let the minister honestly ask himself, how far a *regular occupation* of this nature is consistent with his obligations and his duty?

“In the beginning of the thirteenth century, and throughout the fourteenth, archdeacons, yea and other higher ordinaries, are prohibited from ‘making their progresses with hunting dogs,’ whilst the business of visitation was handed over to the inferior officers. At the present day one may venture to pledge himself, ‘*si quid promittere . . . possum*,’ not to offend, wilfully at least, in this point. Concil. Lond. 1200. Wilk. i. 505. ii. 416. 676. 698.”—*Bayley*, pp. 45, 46.

In this language there is a meekness of wisdom, which, though it may fail to convince an inveterate clerical Nimrod, cannot possibly awaken his resentment. Now, we are not at all more disposed than the Archdeacon, to give offence to gentlemen of this very anomalous class; but it really is an office of charity to apprize them, distinctly, of the very strange figure they present to the eyes of all sober-minded persons. Perhaps the matter may be best brought home to their own convictions, by considering what would probably be the impression made by the first appearance, on any stage, of such a character as a clerical sportsman. Let us imagine that we had never seen or heard of such a combination before: what would be the *first* effect of it upon our nervous system? Would it not operate, like other strange and incongruous mixtures, and raise unextinguishable laughter among gods and men? We can scarcely fancy such a spectacle as one of the judges of the land riding his own racer for the sweepstakes; or figure to ourselves a lord chancellor ambitious of eclipsing the memory of his predecessor in the custody of the great seal, Sir Christopher Hatton—“that inimitable dancer of galliards,”—and seeking at Almack’s for recreation from the toils of the woollack or the bench. But no one can doubt of the incontrollable merriment which would be raised by such an exhibition; allayed, indeed, in the minds of the more serious spectators by a conviction that the parties must be under some influence adverse to the sanity of their mental powers. And this conviction would certainly not be weakened by the grave allegations of those venerable personages, that there could be nothing criminal or immoral in mounting a thorough-bred horse, or swimming through the mazes of a quadrille. Now we do vehemently opine, that—to all dispassionate lookers on—the pursuits of the field, if seen for the

first time engrafted on the character and habits of a priest, would have an appearance to the full as grotesque and odd, as the diversions above alluded to, when exemplified in the persons of dignified and solemn magistrates. We have recently read of some place in South America, where the religious orders are much addicted to cock-fighting; and we presume that even our clerical pursuers of game, themselves, would be somewhat staggered at the sight of the holy brethren assembled round the pit, each with his bird under his arm, and betting as if his salvation depended on the issue of the sport. And yet we do very seriously doubt, whether a spiritual person—whipping, and spurring, and dashing through thick and thin, in the midst of squires, and farmers, and huntsmen, and whippers-in, and the blowing of horns, and the howling of dogs,—we do seriously doubt whether this be a spectacle at all more edifying, or much less ludicrous, than a ring of cock-fighting monks!

To the general body of the clergy themselves we might appeal, on this subject, with the most perfect confidence. They know, full well, that they are not at liberty to consider themselves as country gentlemen in dark-coloured coats: they know, too, that the affectation of any approach to that character is sure to meet with the reward that usually awaits every description of renegades: they are distinctly aware of the scorn with which sporting divines are regarded by the squirarchy of this realm, as well as of the disgust with which they are viewed by their own people: their feelings are elevated far above the wretched ambition of courting the boisterous welcome and good-fellowship of the hunting and fowling classes of the community; for they are not ignorant that persons of that class are sometimes but too apt to give their *outward* support and encouragement to any one who will but make religion sufficiently ridiculous, and thus lower its demands upon their obedience: they are, moreover, deeply impressed with the recollection that their proper office is to wield *the powers of the world to come*; and they know that the contact of low and debasing secularities will steal away their strength, till *the sword of the spirit* drops from their grasp, “*telum imbellè, sine ictu.*”

We are nevertheless afraid that there still remains among the clerical body a remnant faithful to the chase; and by them it is probable that these remarks may be ascribed to a spirit of narrow, illiberal, puritanical austerity. To all such insinuations we should listen with exemplary composure; and in reply to them, we should simply ask these questions: Can there be any mortal now living who will assert, that nothing can degrade a clergyman but positive vice and guilt? Are we to be told, at this time of day, that the clerical profession is not to have its sacred proprieties and its

inviolable decencies, as well as its holy and exalted moralities? Are we to be told, that a minister of religion may be innocently seen one hour attending in the chamber of sickness and of death, and the next, with at least equal anxiety, looking after his hunter in body-clothes? That he may be observed, on Saturday, joining the halloo and the rout, and the coarse turbulence of the field, (in the midst of many a sly sneer at the jockey-parson,) and yet that the same man will be heard with unimpaired reverence on Sunday, when speaking of things which are "lovely and of good report," and "reasoning of righteousness and temperance, and judgment to come?" Are we to be gravely told all this, in a period distinguished from all preceding ones by the general diffusion of intelligence, by the almost omnipresent spirit of inquiry, and by the overpowering sway of public opinion?

No: we venture pretty confidently to pronounce of this class of persons, that their days are numbered; neither the public piety nor the public taste will much longer endure them. The vanities they are following are doomed, at no very distant time, to be swept away into the Paradise of Fools, with other "transitory things, abortive, monstrous, and unkindly mixed." The signs of the times point very plainly to this consummation. Within the memory of living persons, for instance, a man's loyalty and orthodoxy were pretty generally estimated by his riotous libations to Church and King, and his parrot-like and pertinacious cry of *Methodist* at every one who was suspected of saying his prayers and reading his Bible. But these good days are nearly gone by; every decently educated person now knows and feels, that his attachment to the Constitution and the Establishment will never pass current in good society on the strength of his calling hard names and swallowing mighty bumpers. The clergy in general are much too intelligent to believe it safe or creditable for them to be left behind in this career of improvement. A very large portion of them, too, have much more virtue and high principle than to be content with merely following the universal movement: it is both their wisdom and their pride to take a decisive lead in it; they feel that their post is among the standard-bearers of Israel.

On this subject the views of every one must be bright, who has watched the astonishing advancement of the Sacred Profession within the last half-century, and the steady and vigorous pace with which it is still going forward. It is also consolatory to believe—as we do most fervently believe—that the allegiance and attachment of the people are still with the Established Church; and that when they renounce or suspend their communion with it, they often obey, not their own sincere inclina-

tions, but the impulse of some untoward circumstances which they heartily lament. We are persuaded that the clergy at this moment occupy a position from which they may give a movement to the world, if their power is but directed by motives which are *above* the world; and we are convinced that nothing but ignorance, or disregard of their advantages, can prevent their earning, in the fullest measure, the reverence and gratitude of their country, and the title of benefactors to the whole human race.

A spirit, we fully believe, has gone forth, which shall blessedly realize our anticipations and crown our views. That spirit, we trust, will gradually extend a high professional feeling throughout the Sacred Order, and provoke to godly emulation the very humblest of its members. The same spirit, we further hope, will breathe over our Universities, till it has given new vigour and encouragement to those studies which are more immediately connected with the Christian Ministry. The same spirit, we likewise trust, will, by the blessing of God, visit every department of society; and this with a power that might almost create a soul *beneath the ribs of* apathy and spiritual *death*. And, finally, he that hath an ear to hear, let him hear what this same spirit now says to all the faithful sons of the Church by the voice of one of her own ministers.

“Dismissing these topics of constant and everlasting moment, allow me to conclude with some reflections of a present and peculiar interest. It is a not uncommon idea, and arising possibly from a wholesome fear, that the Church is in danger. To me, I confess, there appears nothing in the aspect of the times, no threatening cloud in the political sky, to create or justify alarm. In the diffusion of knowledge, in the progress of intellect, in the elevation of feeling, in the almost omnipotence of public opinion, I seem indeed to hear the sound of a mighty rushing wind, but cannot tell whence it cometh or whither it goeth.

“Peradventure some Minister of Grace may be abroad on a purpose of mercy to the Church: and if so, prepare we to wrestle with that mysterious Power till we obtain the blessing. Be it ours to conciliate its alliance, to consecrate its influences, to direct its energies, and devote them to the service of virtue. And this we must do by meeting it, on our parts, with a corresponding tone of professional sentiment; a broader and deeper cultivation of professional learning; an exacter attention to professional duty and discipline; but especially, and above all, by a more fervent charity among ourselves, and by a personal and paternal superintendence of the national education. The Church of England never sought for stability in ignorance or intolerance; it is founded on the everlasting basis of knowledge and liberality. Its strength and prosperity, under heaven, rest on character; and until it shall cease to deserve that support, the common sense of the country, informed and enlightened as it is at the present day, will protect it against any attack of puritanical phrensy or revolutionary violence.

“ Secure in its proud eminence and impregnable fortifications, the ancient city of God, with its beautiful temple, might still have defied the battering-ram and the torch of the Roman. But ‘rank corruption mined all within;’ discord and sedition and profligacy betrayed the gates, and introduced within the walls, even into the most holy place, the abomination of desolation.

“ The Churches of Asia, illuminated by the earliest rays of the sun of Christianity, fostered by apostolical benediction, and enriched by revelations of the spirit, yet fell from their first love, and forgot their first works. Their golden candlestick was removed; as the vessels of a potter, were they broken to shivers; and the place thereof knoweth them no more.

“ The hour perchance—Heaven in its mercy long avert it!—the hour may come, when a similar fate shall attend our own Jerusalem. Now, we triumphantly call upon our brethren to walk about Zion, and go round about her; to tell the towers thereof, to mark well her bulwarks and to consider her palaces. She is ennobled by the towers of state, fortified by the bulwarks of law, and decorated by the palaces of charity. Built upon the rock of ages, and cemented by the blood of martyrdom, her walls are called salvation, and her gates praise.

“ She is all glorious within. In her tabernacle is seen the ark of the Testament: there are the hallowed trophies of liberty; there are the dedicated spoils of genius and learning, of philosophy and science; and the golden harp of poesy is hung upon the horns of her altar. She is indeed altogether lovely; the perfection of beauty, the joy of the whole earth.

“ But though kings be the nursing-fathers of our Church, and queens its nursing-mothers; though it be wedded to the constitution; though it be consecrated in the hearts and memories, the feelings and habits of the people, yet may it fall. A temple at once and a citadel, she may laugh to scorn the rage and tumult of hostile array—she may shake her head at the crafty assaults of infidel treachery: she will own no fear, till her enemies be those of her own house; she will never perish, but by her own right hand. Should she ever cease to be at unity in herself; should her sons, no longer true to themselves, give way to party ambition, popular faction, or personal animosity, to vicious indifference, secular license, or idolatrous covetousness; should the watchman sleep on his watch-tower, the pastors become brutish, or the idle shepherd leave his flock—should the priest’s lips cease to keep knowledge, or false prophets arise, dividing Christ, and saying ‘lo! He is here, or, lo! He is there,’ then verily, and not till then, her time is near to come, her days are numbered, and may not be prolonged. Then shall her glory depart; the glory of kingdoms, the beauty of Britain’s excellency, shall be swept with the besom of destruction.

“ But away with these visions of unreal terror! To the eye of faith a brighter destiny is revealed; a boundless horizon of duty and happiness is set before us. In either hemisphere, Episcopacy has raised her mitred front; and Charity has gone forth from our sanctuary into the dark and cruel places of the earth, to comfort and to ransom, to civilize

by education, and to bless by religion. A Church, which is thus employed as a special instrument of divine providence, will, we humbly and confidently trust, itself experience the special love and protection of divine omnipotence. Surely, like its heavenly Founder, it will increase in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man: surely, we may hope, the devout and patriotic prayer of each of her sons, will be ratified by the fiat of our common Father; 'Esto perpetua!'

"It remains only, that, with humble and devout hearts, we approach the throne of grace:

"Almighty and everlasting God, by whose spirit the whole body of the Church is governed and sanctified, receive our supplications and prayers, which we offer before thee, for all estates of men in thy holy Church; that every member of the same, in his vocation and ministry, may truly and godly serve thee, through our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. *Amen.*"—*Bayley*, p. 32.

We have already taken so wide a career of observation, that our remaining space is not sufficient to give to Mr. Hornby's sermon the full and distinguished notice which it deserves. It is, in truth, a performance of rare excellence and beauty; and if its perusal leaves any feeling of dissatisfaction behind it, it is, that we have before us an *almost* solitary monument—(ὀλίγον τε φίλον τε)—of the intellect and piety which produced it. Its text is from 1 Cor. xiv. 33: "God is not the author of confusion, but of peace; as in all the Churches of the Saints." We are unable to follow the preacher through those parts of his discourse in which he explains and enforces, with a singular mastery of his subject, the principle of Ecclesiastical Order, as "grounded on nothing less than the nature of God himself, and the end of his universal laws." We hasten to that portion of his address in which he shows how fatally the principle of order is wounded by every Christian minister whose life is at variance with the spirit of his calling. The sentiments of Mr. Hornby are so powerfully auxiliary to those we have expressed above, that we shall not scruple to give them entire. The extract is of rather formidable length, but we cannot spare a single line of it; and we most confidently promise our readers that it will richly repay their patience and attention.

"It is in peculiar reference to the point of order that I would now press upon my younger brethren of the ministry a strict and holy attention to the great business of our lives. I say a holy attention; so, as that we may shape the life, if possible in every circumstance, with reference to its sacred end,—to its bearing upon the duties and success of our ministerial functions. The very characteristic of a clergyman is holiness;—abstraction from secularities;—separation, as respects his tastes and tempers, his feelings and habits, not only from a sensual and wicked, but from a vain and idle, a turbulent and promiscuous world.

It is perhaps too much to say,—as a great authority has said—‘a clergyman should be a clergyman, and nothing else:’ but it is strictly true that he should be a clergyman in every thing. Whatever advantages of rank and fortune he may enjoy, whatever qualities of heart, of mind, and of manner he may possess, he should interweave them into his spiritual character, compelling all to minister to his entireness as a clergyman. He has a most difficult, as well as a most important task to perform: for it is to be performed in the midst of that very world, from which, in heart and mind, he must be separate. It is a great mistake to think that a clergyman ought not to be a man of the world, in the best sense of those words; as indicating a man who both knows human nature, and the particular character of the men whom it is his immediate duty to converse with. It is fitting too that he should be imbued with much of the written wisdom of the world; that the shepherd who leads the Israel of God should be skilled in the learning of the Egyptians. Above all it is, I might almost say, an essential of his effective ministry, that he love the world as a Christian may and ought to love it; that he be free from the sour misanthropy which too often infects the recluse; and that his heart expand towards all men in brotherly kindness and charity. ‘I pray, not that thou shouldest take them out of the world,’ was the Divine Master’s petition for those whom he left as a light in that world which he was quitting: ‘I pray, not that thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that thou shouldest keep them from the evil.’ When left in it they were to be maintained there in the purity of a higher than a worldly principle. ‘They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world:’ and how did he pray that they should be kept? In the holiness of the spirit of the divine word—‘sanctify them with thy truth;’ ‘as thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world,’ that they might instruct, reform, and edify it; that they might be, therein, pure, active, exemplary; that they might go about doing good; but that they might live above it, and ‘keep themselves unspotted from it.’

“With the men of the world we must mix: but, that we may perform our ministry with effect, we must mix with them,—though freely,—yet in such a form that they may see in us that distinctness which becomes those who are devoted to the service of God in the world, in order that they may lead others in the way to heaven. If, as the salt of the earth, we must descend into it to preserve it fertile and uncorrupt, we ought yet to mingle with it so as rather to diffuse a sanctity of our own, than ourselves to imbibe an earthly savour. This may be done; and pity it is we do not see it done commonly. All the learning, and many of the graces and accomplishments of the world, may be a part, and a most harmonious part, in the character of a truly saintly clergyman. He may have all the world’s activity;—more than all its cheerfulness. There may be added, and without injuring the saintly harmony, the world’s rank and honours, and the world’s wealth. But, in each and all of these, the purifying line of distinction must be carefully maintained. All things must be kept subordinate, and so in their proper place; they must bring ornament and strength, but no defilement, no desecration, into the sanctuary. Learning must not make us merely speculative; since it is for works of saving activity that we had need be wise. Accomplishments,

though they sweeten our means of general intercourse, must not cast upon the most serious of human engagements a suspicion of frivolity or of strenuous idleness. Our activity must be calm,—our cheerfulness such as needs not restraint: our rank and honours must be fitly borne, as a part in the graduated decorations of the world, not as made for ourselves, and to be vainly rejoiced in. Our wealth must be dispensed as a deposit entrusted to us, not as a possession in which we trust. In a word, we must use the world as not abusing it in any of its good things; we must give evidence that it does not lower and hold us down; all the while we live in it we must live as men ‘whose conversation is in heaven.’

“If there be a painful anomaly in existence it is the heart and mind of a clergyman in whom the world has predominant rule; who is seduced from the proper sanctity of his order by its business or its pleasures, its honours or absurdities. A profligate clergyman is a monster in nature?—a character of rare occurrence, and, when appearing, odious and disgusting even in the eyes of profligates themselves. But it is not of so rare concurrence—(though I thank God it is every day more and more rare)—to see a man belonging to the ministry who mixes in the world with less of discretion than is for the good of others or of himself: a man who minds, and exemplarily performs, the great duties of his peculiar office and state; but who disregards, and therefore offends in, the less momentous, but certainly not less visible, niceties of duty: a man who maintains the separating quality of holiness up to a point; but who extends it not into minute particularities. There is a moral and religious confusion in this: we are a distinct class—separated unto the Lord: upon every part of our lives should be inscribed the uniform and conspicuous character of holiness. It is a written precept to ‘abstain from all appearance of evil.’ We must not even be misconstrued, if any reasonable care of ours may make the whole of our character appear right. We must ‘give no offence in any thing, that the ministry be not blamed’—lest we cast a reflected censure on our order. ‘Every vessel in Jerusalem and in Judah should be holiness unto the Lord of Hosts.’ In the homely, but expressive, analogy of Scripture ‘the pots in the Lord’s house shall be like the bowls before the altar.’ Even ‘upon the very bridles of the horses—(so minute is the attention to mere externals)—there shall be holiness unto the Lord.’ Let this, my brethren, be our characteristic—holiness in the great essentials diffusing itself into all the most, apparently, insignificant parts. Without any affection of precise singularity, let us be marked by all men as distinct,—signalized by traits of our own. They will love us, as well as respect us, when they see that we are every thing that our separate order calls us to be; that we have an enlightened reason for all we do; and that we make a conscience of doing it. Let there be no inconsistency in any part of our lives, may ‘the very God of peace sanctify us wholly!’”—*Hornby*, pp. 21—27.

The above passage irresistibly recalls us, for one moment, to the clerical brethren of the chase. If Mr. Hornby’s sermon, or this portion of it, should chance to fall into the hands of any one of them, we would earnestly beseech him, first, to give it a patient and attentive perusal. And when he has done this, we would

further ask of him, to go at once—and while the influence of it is fresh upon his mind—to the closet, adjoining, perhaps, the very shelves on which his Concordance and “Common-place Book of the Bible” are reposing; and having opened it, to survey, there hung up, the whole costume and equipment of the field:—the powder flask, the shot-belt, the dog-whip, the dog-whistle, the Joe Manton, the buff leather gaiters, and the short-tailed jacket, with its endless apparatus of pockets; and when he has gone over the items of this precious inventory, we would beg of him to ask himself, “Is not all this sad masking stuff,” wherein to disguise the character so admirably portrayed above? Is not this sorry gear for one whose highest honour is to be called a *fisher of men*; a captivator of immortal souls; one, whose net should incessantly ply to raise up sinners from the depths of Satan, and to transfer them to the wells and fountains of Salvation? We do in sober earnestness recommend this experiment. We, seriously, have great hopes from the effect of the contrast. We do not despair of its inducing the executioner of pheasants, and the pursuer of vermin, to ponder a little on the nature of those strange transformations he is perpetually undergoing, from an evangelist into a sportsman; and to reflect, with something like dismay, on the vile enchantment, by which alone that almost Circæan metamorphosis could be accomplished!

We produce the testimony of Mr. Hornby, on such matters, with the greatest confidence, not only because it is the testimony of a mind of the first order, but also because it is *not* the testimony of one whose allegiance to the Church is at all dubious, or whose mental vision has suffered the slightest disturbance from the influence of fanaticism. It is moreover the testimony, not of a recluse but a social man; a man too (if we mistake not) of high connections, and affluent means; particulars which we mention, because, to a certain extent, it is true, that “where virtue is, these make more virtuous:” they show, at least, that the doctrine of self-denial is not here preached by one who disparages pursuits and enjoyments placed beyond his reach. The suggestions and opinions of Mr. Hornby can never be put down by the stupid outcry of Puritans and Methodists!

On the whole, we rise from the perusal of this composition with inexpressible refreshment of spirit. It seems to speak to us of glorious days in store for the Established Church. It animates us too with the spectacle of a man who is content to bring his treasures and his precious things, his frankincense and gold, and to lay them at the feet of the Saviour. It proves, triumphantly, that the most splendid resources of intellect can find no employment so truly dignified as the Service of the Giver.

ART. XI.—*The Expectations formed by the Assyrians, that a great Deliverer would appear, about the time of our Lord's Advent, demonstrated.* London. Bagster. 1826. 8vo. 10s.

THERE are few parts of learning so involved in obscurity, as the history of Pagan Idolatry. It may, perhaps, be some satisfaction to us to think that the ancients themselves knew even less of the matter than we do; but if so, it furnishes a strong argument for the necessity of being very cautious in drawing our conclusions. We believe it may safely be said, that there is not one among all the fabled deities of antiquity, whom (if the writers of antiquity may be trusted,) it is not possible to identify with every other—Saturn, Jupiter, Mercury, Pan, Hercules, Priapus, Bacchus; Bel, Moloch, Chemosh; Taut, Thoth, Osiris; Buddha, Vishnou, Siva; all and each of these may be shown, by arguments of weight, to be one and the same person. And whether we suppose this person to have been the Sun, or to have been Adam, or Seth, or Enoch, or Noah, or Shem, or Ham, or Japhet, the conclusion will be still the same; each of them, it may be shown, was worshipped as the Sun; and all of them, wherever their worship was established, were severally considered as the Great Mythological Divinity. So far, it would not appear that there is any room for much difference of opinion; at least, not if ancient authorities may be depended on. But who are we to understand as the Great Divinity of heathen mythology? At this point a vast field of opinion and speculation opens to us, upon which it is not our present intention to enter. One thing appears to be quite clear: that the symbols under which the principal dogmas, both of the eastern and western idolatry were represented, manifestly point to one common origin, the true explanation of which is to be found in the book of Genesis.

We do not mean to say that there is any solid reason to suppose that the Heathens borrowed their opinions from the book of Genesis; but that they drew them from the same common source, namely, from the traditional knowledge of the Creation of the world, and of the deluge, as that knowledge existed among mankind both before and after the time of Moses. All that was true in the tradition of mankind, at that age, has been recorded in the Pentateuch; we find the same truths in Sanconiathon, in Berosus, in Manetho, and in the symbols of heathen superstition; but dressed out in fables, and mixed with various fantastical additions. Supposing the Mosaic account to be correct, this is precisely what might have been anticipated; the supposition popularly received, that the heathens borrowed their knowledge

from the Jews, or even were instructed in it by the Patriarchs, is not only attended with historical difficulty, but would remove one of the very strongest possible testimonies to the truth of what Moses has written; inasmuch as in proving the truth of his history, it is better to suppose that he was merely prevented by God from falling into error, than that his knowledge of the facts which he has related was directly communicated to him by inspiration; seeing that he has conveyed to us no information concerning the history of our first parents and of the deluge, which might not have been preserved in tradition, nor which probably would not have been so preserved, supposing the facts to be really true. From Adam to Noah, there was but one man, namely Methuselah, who was contemporary with both; from Noah to Abraham, only one, namely Shem, who saw them both; from Abraham to Joseph, there is but one man, namely Isaac, Joseph's grandfather; and Amram, the father of Moses, might have conversed with Joseph.*

Supposing therefore the Mosaic History to be genuine, the difficulty is not to explain how the truths which he has communicated to us came so long to be preserved in tradition, but how they came so soon to be depraved. With respect to the history of the deluge, there is not a single particular set down by Moses, but may be found adumbrated under some idolatrous symbol or other; and indeed the fragment of Berosus preserved in Eusebius, and the tract of Lucian concerning the "Syrian Goddess," especially the latter, contain decisive evidence to the knowledge of the heathens on every point connected with the history of Noah and his family. The traces which remain of ante-diluvian tradition are fewer and more uncertain; but they are sufficient for verifying the account which Moses has delivered. To say nothing of the division of time, both with respect to the days of the week, and the number of hours in the day, the supposed sacredness of the seventh day, the institution of sacrifice, as well as of a great variety of co-incidencies between the mythological cosmogonies and the true history of the creation:—the symbolical worship of the serpent alone, which obtained among all the nations of antiquity, is a fact which stands prominently forward. If the reader wishes to satisfy himself on this subject, he may turn to Eusebius (*Præp. Evang. lib. i. c. 10.*) where he will find the reasons, stated at large, which the ancient sages gave for this apparently unaccountable superstition. But whatever difficulty they may have had in explaining the meaning of this strange worship, we need have none, if we may believe Faber, who tells us (*vol. i. 442.*) on the

* Allix, *Reflexions on Scripture*, p. i. cxvii.

authority of ancient writers whom he quotes, that "Hercules was sometimes represented in the act of contending with a serpent, whose head was placed under his heel;" he adds on the same authority, that the serpent was supposed to be the same as that which guarded the golden fruit in the Garden of Hesperides. Two sculptured figures, he also tells us, are yet extant in one of the oldest Pagodas, the former of which represents Chrishna, an incarnation of Vishnou, trampling on the crushed head of a serpent; while in the other, the poisonous reptile is exhibited encircling the deity in its folds, and biting his heel.

It is evident, then, we think, that the history of the Fall was preserved alive in the tradition of mankind from the earliest ages; but we are acquainted with no passage in any writer of remote antiquity, nor with any mythological symbol of any kind, which would lead us to suppose, that the belief and expectation of a "Deliverer" was preserved among the Heathens. The expectation of a King that was to arise in the east, to which Tacitus and Suetonius allude, as existing about the time when Christ was born, has always seemed to us, as owing its origin entirely to the dispersion of the Jews over every part of the world, in the time preceding Christianity, and to the consequent knowledge of their prophecies, which was by this means spread among mankind. Had this opinion been part of the tradition of mankind, at the period when our evidence for the existence of the other parts of ante-diluvian tradition is found, it might have been conjectured that some clear hints of it would have been traceable either in the writings or in the worship of the early heathens. This no writer, hitherto, has pretended to have discovered; we are able to trace the *delivery* of the promise to mankind, among the superstitions of every nation of antiquity; but the true *sense* of it was preserved only among the Jews, and by them not fully understood, until subsequent communications from God had rendered the original prophecy intelligible.

In saying this, we are speaking only of the state of the question, as it was before this work of Mr. Nolan's appeared. His object is to show that the knowledge of a Deliverer existed among mankind from the earliest times, and in fact formed an integral part of the religious institutions of the heathens, both of Asia and Europe. This belief, he thinks, was the foundation of the worship that was paid to one of the principal deities among the Assyrians; it afterwards spread, he says, into Egypt and Phenicia, and finally constituted the worship that was paid to Mercury among the western nations of the world.

Abstractedly, there is nothing at all improbable or paradoxical

in the proposition which Mr. Nolan maintains; on the contrary, it is one to which we should very readily yield our belief on any reasonable evidence; and though we do not think it to be a matter of importance, viewed as a theological point, whether he is right or wrong, yet we confess that we opened his book with every disposition to embrace his opinion. The proof of it would have given a neatness and completeness to the argument, from tradition in confirmation of the patriarchal religion, which, though not at all necessary to establish the credit of the book of Genesis, would yet seem to be gratifying to the imagination.

But it is in literature as in war: a man may sometimes deserve victory who is not able to command it. If it had been in the power of mere learning to establish the point which Mr. Nolan labours, or if logical conclusions could be made good by strenuousness of argument, his success would certainly have been conspicuous. As it is, the only conviction which we have obtained from a very attentive perusal of his work, is great respect for the extensive reading which it displays; our belief in the proposition which he has maintained with so much ingenuity and such stores of erudition, is not at all advanced; and we can very truly say that we are sorry for it. It is somewhat difficult to analyze the argument of Mr. Nolan, but we will endeavour to place it before our readers as intelligibly as we can.

We are told that in some mountains of the east, not far from Babylon, a sect exists, known to the orientalists under the name of Sabaists, who trace their religion up to the patriarch Seth, and whom therefore Mr. Nolan calls Sethites. The name of Sabaists, or Sabians, they profess to derive from Sabi, the son of Enoch; but the object of their more peculiar veneration is the first-mentioned patriarch, whose writings, Mr. Nolan tells us, (he does not say on what authority,) they still profess to retain. They acknowledge the Divine Author of Christianity, but hold this belief in conjunction with such a variety of impure practices and absurd tenets, as excludes them from being numbered among Christians; they would rather seem to be the same with a sect of Heretics mentioned by Epiphanius, under the name of Sethians, who classes them in the same division with two other sects of a similar character, such as the Cainites and Ophites, an account of whom is given by Fabricius, in his *Codex Pseudeisigraphus*.

These Sethians, or Sethites, Mr. Nolan labours to identify with the ancient Sabæans, described by Maimonides, whose supposed descendants are spoken of, at great length, by Hyde, in his *Hist. Vet. Pers.* Presuming this identity to be established, he next endeavours to show that the tradition of a Deliverer has existed among these people, from the very remotest antiquity, even

from before the days of Moses. The proof of this position he draws from the Epistle of St. Jude. The Apostle speaks of those "*who have gone into the way of Cain, and ran greedily after the error of Balaam.*" By these last, Mr. Nolan thinks that an evident allusion is made to the Sethites; but a still more important part of the Epistle is that where St. Jude quotes a prophecy of Enoch, foretelling the "*coming of the Lord to Judgment.*" It is certain, he says, that Enoch was numbered, by the Sethites, among the founders of their sect, and therefore it cannot be doubted, that this prophecy was to be found among their sacred books. Moreover, since the authenticity of the prophecy is admitted by an inspired Apostle, who uses it as an authority, of course it must have existed from the earliest antiquity. It was therefore known to Balaam, and to the Sethites of his day, who lived in Assyria, of which country Balaam was a native. All these several points Mr. Nolan enlarges upon at some length; and having thus laid his foundation, he proceeds to build up his hypothesis by arguments of a more direct kind. These are chiefly drawn from a new version which he proposes of some expressions in Balaam's celebrated prophecy (Numb. xxiii.); but before we proceed to an examination of this part of his proofs, it may perhaps be convenient to direct our consideration, first, to the several positions laid down by him as preliminary facts: when we shall see the difficulties with which these are encumbered, we shall be better prepared to form a correct judgment of some of his after opinions. We are ready to do full justice to the learning and ability which Mr. Nolan has displayed in the manner in which he has drawn out his proofs; but we doubt extremely whether they amount to that absolute demonstration which he seems to suppose.

The first point which he lays down, but which we are far from thinking that he has established, is, that the Sethites of whom Epiphanius speaks are the same as the Sabæans of whom Maimonides tells us. There is no allusion to such an opinion in the account given of them by Epiphanius; and by Tertullian they are expressly designated as *Judaismi hæreticos*. In the Codex Pseudeisigraphus of Fabricius, vol. i. xlviii., we have a brief history of their chief opinions, from which we should certainly have drawn this last conclusion; indeed the summary which Mr. Nolan himself gives us of their doctrines, as explained by Hyde, from the writings of their supposed descendants in the present day, appears to us, as clearly pointing to a Jewish origin. Again, if we look to Maimonides, there is still the same absence of all evidence in support of our author's opinion. We are told (Mor. Nevochim, pars iii. xxxix.) that it is well known that Abraham was educated among the Zabæans, *quæ gens totum terrarum orbem impleverat*,

and not any particular spot in Assyria, as Mr. Nolan appears to intimate. They worshipped the Sun, and the Moon, and the Stars, according to this learned Jew; and with respect to any opinions which they may afterwards have adopted, any one may see, says he, "*qui leviter tantum et superficialiter rem consideret, conficta esse ab illis* POSTEA QUAM LEX NOSTRA GENTIBUS INNOTUIT." But neither in his account of their present or original opinions, does Maimonides use any word which would lead us to identify them with the Sethites. In his tract upon "Idolatry," of which Vossius, at the end of his learned book *de Idolatria*, has given us a translation, the origin of the Sabæan heresy is directly ascribed by Maimonides, not only to the times of Enoch, but even to Enoch himself: *ipse etiam Enos inter errantes erat*. Further we must observe, that the Apostle St. Jude speaks of the *Cainites*, and of those who had gone into the "errors of Balaam," but he says nothing of the Sethites mentioned by Epiphanius. Whether these last are to be understood by those who fell into "the errors of Balaam," is the point to be proved; but we are not aware of any fact, nor does our author adduce any, by which such an opinion can be shown to have any solid foundation. With respect to the modern Sethites, even supposing them, as we do, to be a remnant of an ancient sect, whatever evidence there is upon this point goes to prove that they were Jewish, and not patriarchal heretics; as to their own declarations on the subject, be they what they may, we should regard them as of little value; and looking at their doctrines, we agree with Tertullian and Maimonides in thinking that they are mere corruptions of the Jewish Scriptures. Thus much with respect to our opinion of the proof on which the supposition of Balaam having been a Sethite is founded, and which afterwards is made so important a link in Mr. Nolan's reasoning: we do not say that the son of Beor was or was not a Sethite, but merely that there is no evidence to warrant such a supposition.

With respect to the prophecy of Enoch, quoted by St. Jude, and from which Mr. Nolan thinks that the knowledge of a "Deliverer" must necessarily have been known to the ancient Sabæans: even supposing that the use made of this prophecy by the Apostle proves that he himself believed it to be genuine, and that this opinion of the Apostle's necessarily involves the fact of its being so, still it remains to be proved, both that the knowledge of it was preserved among the *Sethites*, (of whom no mention is made by the Apostle,) and also that the Sethites of Epiphanius and the ancient Sabæans are the same. When St. Paul (Titus, i. 12.) tells the Cretans that "*one of themselves, even a prophet of their own*," calls them "*liars and evil beasts*," no one supposes that the Apostle is to be understood as attributing a divine character to

the writings of Callimachus or Epimenides, or whomsoever the writer may be whose words are quoted; but merely that the Apostle was fighting the Cretans with their own weapons. There is certainly some difficulty in putting this construction upon the argument of St. Jude; but if the prophecy which he quotes belonged to the book of Enoch, of which some large fragments have been preserved by Syncellus, and which is still supposed to be preserved among the Jews, by one of whom it is quoted with praise, (Fabricius, *Cod. Pseud. supra*,) it would be quite evident that the Apostle was only employing it as an *argumentum ad hominem* against the particular persons to whom he writes, and not as a demonstrative argument. If this last supposition be thought, nevertheless, not to agree with the Apostle's manner of expressing himself, in that case we should agree with Wolfius, that the Apostle was quoting, not from any actual book, but merely from the authority of a tradition, which, however, there is not any evidence for assigning to an Assyrian origin. The whole dependence of Mr. Nolan's argument rests upon the words "error of Balaam," which, if we refer to his supposed Sabæan heresy, and not to his cupidity, will leave us quite at a loss to explain the meaning of "for reward," (*ἀντὶ τοῦ μισθοῦ*,) which immediately follows. The "error of Balaam for reward" is the same, we imagine, as the "way of Balaam," which Peter speaks of, "*who loved the wages of unrighteousness*."—(2 Pet. ii. 15.) We do not wish to press our objection to Mr. Nolan's opinions in this part of his work, farther than the spirit of fair criticism will justify; but when he tells us, on the authority of this passage in St. Jude, "that the spirit of prophecy rested on the posterity of Seth," (by which word we presume he means to include others besides Enoch,) and that this is "not merely a supposition resting on probability, but a fact supported by inspired authority of one of the apostolical writers," (p. 33); when he afterwards goes on to quote, as connected with this position, passages from the fragments preserved by Syncellus, we certainly feel ourselves called upon to exercise some circumspection. "*Tot enim in illis*," said Joseph Scaliger, speaking of these fragments, which he himself first brought to light—" *tot enim in illis quorum piget, tædet, pudetque ut nisi scirem Judæorum esse mentiri, neque nunc eos illas nugas desinere posse, ne digna quidem censuissem quæ legerentur*." More wretched stuff, than they are, indeed, cannot be conceived.

Having thus stated the difficulties which appear to us to lie in the way of Mr. Nolan's preliminary propositions, we now come to consider the circumstantial evidence which he adduces in support of the preceding hypothesis. As the link of connexion between the premises which he has heretofore been laying down,

and his final proof of the conclusion to which he arrives, is drawn from the prophecy of Balaam, we shall present our readers with his account of this remarkable person. We shall omit the notes, which are long and abstruse, merely observing that they are full of learning and research, and sufficiently warrant all the several points in the history of Balaam, which the author brings forward.

“The fortieth year had nearly expired, after the Israelites had taken their departure from Egypt, and they had reached their last encampment in the plains of Moab, when Balak invited Balaam from Syria, by a special deputation of his nobles, to oppose the new invaders with his enchantments. Of the occupation or country of the seer, whose assistance the King of Moab required, there can be little room for dispute, whatever difficulties have been raised on the subject by those who have investigated his history, or expounded his prediction.

“Balaam is termed by his contemporary, Moses, ‘the son of Beor of Pethor of *Mesopotamia* ;’ or, ‘Syria between the two rivers ;’ in which designation he is at once identified as a native Assyrian. Had we been at any loss to ascertain the country of the seer of Pethor, thus clearly defined by its natural boundaries, some light might be attained in discovering its site, from his own representation in declaring, that ‘the King of Moab brought him *from Syria*, out of the *mountains* of the east.’ The plains of *Mesopotamia* are overlooked by the Cordyæan mountains; and both the elevated and plain country were inhabited by Sabians, whose tenets Balaam was instrumental in propagating among the Israelites. His country should be, however, rather sought near the upper Chaldea, which was also mountainous, and was situated to the north of *Mesopotamia*, which is equally represented, by the oriental traditions, as infested by the Sabian superstitions. In the vicinity of this region, the Greek and Latin writers place some schools of the Chaldee diviners, to one of which they ascribe a name, which may be derived from the Pethor, whence Balaam was designated, with less violence to orthography than has been offered to many oriental terms, avowedly transmitted to us by these writers.

“In determining the profession of Balaam, there exists as little room for doubt, as in ascertaining his country. He is designated in Scripture as ‘Balaam the son of Beor, the soothsayer,’ or diviner. The Chaldean sages have been divided, by the writer who has most accurately described them, into four kinds; of whom the second addicted themselves to the arts of divination; recourse being had to astrology and augury, to obtain an insight into futurity. From an acquired proficiency in these arts, we have authority from Scripture to suppose, that Balaam obtained the repute, and acquired the appellation, of a diviner.

“Nor can his claims to a higher or prophetic character, previously to his entering on his mission to Moab, be supported on the same authority, although he has been termed ‘a prophet’ by the Apostle. In reconciling this title with his designation as ‘a diviner,’ it is unnecessary to suppose, that it has been catachrestically applied, as by another apostle,

from being commonly conferred on the Chaldean seers by the orientlists. With that sacred character the Mesopotamian diviner became invested, from the time that he uttered the remarkable prophecy, which he delivered to Balak. On that occasion the Scripture accordingly describes the influence by which he was moved, in terms that are only applicable to those who were divinely inspired, and who possessed the prophetic vision. That he was then visited by an afflation of the divinity, to which he had been previously a stranger, seems to be implied in the influence which it possessed in inducing him to renounce his delusive art: 'he went not, as at other times, to seek for enchantments,' or augury.

"The wisdom of selecting a seer, from the country of diviners, to fill the high office on which Balaam was deputed, is sufficiently apparent, without any laboured illustration: his mission derived advantages from his fame as a soothsayer, which it could scarcely have acquired from his character as a prophet. Had it secured no other object than to give the Israelites the assurance of a diviner, and one the most highly reputed in his art, 'that there was no enchantment against Jacob, neither any divination against Israel,' in attaining this end, its wisdom had been obvious. On the nations existing out of the Jewish pale to whom the prediction of Balaam was addressed, and for whom it was principally intended, its operation was of more obvious importance. From them a more ready assent was obtained to the truths, which Balaam was instrumental in revealing, in consequence of their being delivered by one of their compatriots, whose fame must have been generally diffused, as it extended from Mesopotamia to Moab. In the temporary conversion of so reputed a seer, and the public renunciation of his errors, before the assembled nobles of Midian and Moab, a salutary lesson was inculcated before those nations, upon whose superstition the delusive art which he practised had exercised a tyrannous and degrading influence."—p. 35.

Having thus put his reader in possession of all the particulars that can be collected concerning the person of Balaam, Mr. Nolan next proceeds to an examination of his celebrated prophecy. He first puts it into the Samaritan character, in which it was written originally, and then gives us what he considers as the true translation.

"The saw of Balaam the son of Beor,
And the saw of the man whose eye is closed;
The saw of him who heard the Word of God,
And knew the knowledge of the Highest;
Who beheld the vision of the Almighty,
Falling [entranced] and being illumined in sight.
I shall see Him, but not now;
I shall behold Him, but not near.
A star shall proceed out of Jacob,
A sceptre shall rise out of Israel,
And shall break the *Termini* of Moab
And destroy all the *Sethites*."—p. 47.

The remainder of the prophecy, in which the Prophet denounces the destruction of Moab, is also given by Mr. Nolan; but as we do not mean to offer any remarks upon his interpretation of this part of the prophecy, in which, according to our author, it is the Assyrians, and not the people of Israel, who are predicted as the future conquerors of Balak's territory—an opinion, we believe, in which he is entirely singular,—we shall confine our attention to those parts of his argument which appear to us as of fundamental importance to his conclusion; in which point of view the two concluding lines of his translation will require to be particularly examined.

The common translation is, "There shall come a Star out of Jacob, and a Sceptre shall rise out of Israel, and shall smite the corners of Moab, and destroy all the *children of Sheth*."—(Numb. xxiv. 17.) Mr. Nolan translates the passage, and "shall break the *Termini* of Moab, and destroy all the *Sethites*." We shall have to say a few words upon the merits of his translation hereafter, but first of all we must explain the connexion which it holds with the chain of his general argument.

We have already seen that Mr. Nolan is of opinion "that the spirit of prophecy rested upon the posterity of Seth;" and that they had among them an authentic book of Enoch, in which "the coming of the Lord to judgment" was distinctly prophesied. If, then, the posterity of Seth, or the Sethites, mentioned by Epiphanius, were the same as the Sabæans of whom Maimonides speaks, among whom Abraham was educated, and who, according to Mr. Nolan, dwelt in that part of Mesopotamia of which Balaam was a native, as we have just now seen, then the knowledge of a "Great Deliverer," he argues, existed among the Assyrians. But his proof does not rest here; among the gods of the Assyrians, Isaiah mentions Nebo, in conjunction with Bel. Now Nebo, we are told, was the same as Mercury; but Mercury was represented in the form of a Terminus; when the Prophet, therefore, says "he shall break the *Termini* of Moab," he is to be understood, says Mr. Nolan, as speaking of the idolatrous images of Nebo, who was worshipped under that form. The question then is, who was Nebo? The name Nebo, he proceeds to tell us, means "The Prophesied," in other words, the "Great Deliverer," who, as the prophecy of Enoch informed the Sethites, "was to come to execute judgment, with ten thousand of his saints."

We pay a most willing tribute of praise to the ingenuity of the argument by which this conclusion is attempted to be established, and would very gladly acquiesce in its truth, if it had been at all borne out by the evidence; but, we fear, there are few of the

steps in the whole reasoning which will bear the test of examination.

We do not pretend to oppose our opinion to that of Mr. Nolan on a mere point of Hebrew criticism; but we have no theory to maintain, and he has,—a disadvantage on his part which certainly diminishes our confidence in his judgment in the particular case before us. He translates the words which in our Bible are given “the children of Sheth,” by the apparently equivalent expression “Sethites.” In support of this deviation he does not say that there is only one word in the Hebrew, nor that our translators have committed a mistake; but he tells us, that for the same reason that “sons of Israel” means “Israelites,” so also “sons of Seth” is synonymous with “Sethites.” But if there be no greater difference, in the meaning which he wishes us to attach to the word “Sethites” and the phrase “sons of Sheth,” than there is between the word “Israelites” and “sons of Israel,” why, we will ask, did Mr. Nolan think it necessary to change the received translation? This last is not only indisputably a literal translation, but is borne out by the Septuagint, and by every commentator without exception. His translation may, indeed, be also right in words; but when we know that under the name Sethites the *idea* to be slipped in is, not “sons of Sheth,” but “*worshippers* of Sheth,” we think our readers will pause before they agree with our author, at least in the present case, that בני שֵׁת, literally “children of Sheth,” means Sethites. It is indeed evident that Mr. Nolan was himself not quite unaware of the concealed sophism couched under his proposed interpretation, for at p. 98 he tells us, that the Prophet could not “be understood literally, as including all the posterity of Seth,” (as all the posterity, however, of Israel were included under the word Israelites,) for that in this case he would have “proscribed the Redeemer himself,” who was a descendant of the Patriarch. No doubt he was, as are all mankind through Noah; and this is the reason why every interpreter, without any exception we believe, has always understood the passage to be equivalent to “all the sons of Adam.” The reader has only to take down the Critici Sacri, and he will soon be satisfied how little reason there is for adopting any other interpretation. Let us now examine the reasoning by which Mr. Nolan endeavours to persuade us that the words of the prophecy, which in our translation are rendered “*corners of Moab*,” ought properly to have been translated “*Termini of Moab*.”

After premising that the hills on which Balak directed Balaam to sacrifice were consecrated, probably, to the Assyrian idols,

Peor and Nebo, and that on this last mountain a temple was erected to Chemosh, another of the Moabitish deities, he tells us, "that as an identity is admitted between Peor and Chemosh, and as Nebo is also allowed to have partaken of the common resemblance in which they agreed, we cannot greatly err in supposing that these idols, if not of the same kind, were at least distinguished by the same emblems."—p. 89.

For this opinion Mr. Nolan has the authority of Selden, so far as the identity of Peor and Chemosh is concerned; and we think he has probability on his side in saying that Baal-Peor and Priapus are the same. On what ground he determines that Nebo is the same as Mercury in particular, rather than Apollo or Hercules, or any other heathen god, we must confess, we are somewhat at a loss to understand. He produces the authority of Hyde, not in Peritsol. Synt. Dissert. t. i. p. 53., to show that Mercury was the same as Baal-Peor, but none whatever, that we are able to see, for supposing him to have been Nebo, except that "Priapus and Mercury were both represented in the form of a Terminus" (p. 90); which indeed, if we may believe Faber, Pagan Idol. vol. ii. p. 377—388, was symbolical of other gods as well as those here mentioned. Jupiter Terminalis is said by Diodorus to be the god Terminus, to whom Numa dedicated land-marks; and Hercules Terminus is mentioned by Lucian as one of the Gallic deities. We have made these observations merely to show the great uncertainty which must necessarily hang over all conclusions that depend upon mythological symbols; but as the subject is before us, it may not be amiss to add a few remarks that will further illustrate this part of Mr. Nolan's argument.

Every reader who has taken the trouble of looking at the works of those who have written upon the history of the ancient mythology, is familiar with discussions upon the origin of stone-worship among the heathens. Of its antiquity there is no doubt; it is directly alluded to in the Phenician history of Sanconiathon, and traces of it may be found, in abundance, in the worship of both the Greeks and Romans, as well as of the Egyptians. These sacred emblems, or whatever we are to call them, (for the ancients appear to have supposed them endowed with life, λίθες ἐμψύχες,) were called Baithulia; a name, it is commonly supposed, derived from Jacob's pillar at Bethel (Gen. xxviii. 18). The passage must be familiar to our readers: when the Patriarch awoke out of his vision in the morning, we are told that he exclaimed, "*How dreadful is this place! this is no other than the House of God! And he rose up, took the stone that he had put for his pillow, and set it up for a pillar, and poured oil upon the top of it. And he*

called the name of that place *Beth-el*"—which last word literally signifies the "House of God."

As Sanconiathon mentions Betylos as one of the four sons of Uranus, it may perhaps be slightly doubtful whether the name Baithulia is derived from Beth-el or from the Phenician deity, or, as Mr. Faber thinks, from Bath-ila, which are names of Buddha. The best authorities, and among others Bochart, are in favour of the first derivation; but be this as it may, a very easy explanation is given, we think, by this passage, of the origin of the worship paid to certain supposed sacred stones by the heathen. It appears from the words of Jacob (21, 22), that the stone was set up by him in memorial of the vow which he then made, of dedicating to God a tenth of all that Providence should bless him with. Instances of the same custom, in after times, may be found in Exod. xxiv. 4, and Jos. iv. 5, xxiv. 26; and we think that in Gen. xii. 8, we trace pretty evidently the same religious institution. Jacob says, "This stone which I have set up for a pillar shall be *God's House*;" (v. 22.) an expression which sufficiently marks the sacredness of such consecrated memorials in the eyes of the Patriarch: it not only accounts for the name Betylos or Bethulia, for the word is variously written, but also for the idolatrous worship of which they afterwards became the object. There is not the least reason to suppose that Jacob was the original institutor of this peculiar form of commemorating religious covenants and transactions; nor, consequently, to suppose that such monuments were not numerous among the descendants of the first family of mankind. But the reflection which we wish to draw from this celebrated passage refers to another point.

Mr. Nolan evidently thinks that the worship paid to the Baithulia, was one and the same with the religious veneration of the *Termini* of Mercury. This opinion is, we believe, very commonly received, but we own that we entertain many doubts upon the subject. The reader will find in Witsius (*Egyptiacorum*, lib. ii. c. vii. c. xi.) a long list of passages extracted from various ancient authors, in almost every one of which, it appears that the Baithulia were worshipped not as symbols, but as being themselves divine; and in not one are they supposed to have any relation to the worship of Mercury or Priapus, or of any other particular deity of the Heathens. If from Witsius we turn to Fabricius *Bib. Græca*, lib. i. c. xi. we find a variety of other passages from ancient authors, in which the history of Hermes and of the *hermata* or *termini* is fully discussed; and in every one of these we find that the writers whom Fabricius quotes all agree in ascribing the origin of them to the ancient custom of inscribing upon stones laws and inventions, and whatever facts or other information it was wished

to hand down to posterity. In this way, it has been said that all that remains to us of the history of primitive antiquity has been preserved; and as Hermes (who is unquestionably the Thoth of the Egyptians,) was supposed to be the god who presided over learning, wherever stones or pillars having inscriptions on them were found, of which the real authors were unknown, they were attributed, by the popular superstition, to Thoth, or Hermes, or Mercury, according to the country in the language of which the inscriptions were written. This point we think may be as clearly demonstrated, as far as authority will reach, as any fact in the whole circle of our knowledge of the early traditions of mankind. If therefore the Baithulia originated in the patriarchal custom of which we have an instance in the passages from the Pentateuch above quoted; they are, we think, most undoubtedly entirely distinct from the *σηλαί* or columnæ attributed to Mercury. By the "Termini of Moab," however, Mr. Nolan evidently understands the Baithulia, that is to say, pillars, such as were erected by Jacob; owing their origin, as we think, to a corruption of the patriarchal Religion, and having nothing whatever to do with the *hermata* of Mercury; on which supposition his translation involves, in our opinion, an historical difficulty, and one of which he was not aware. So strong indeed is our feeling of this difficulty, that supposing the Hebrew word which Mr. Nolan translates *Termini*, really to signify that which the Romans and other western nations understood by the expression, we should at once, and even for no other reason, doubt whether the word had not some sense in the original, the knowledge of which had been lost.

But we are not driven to any such alternative: a very slight inspection of our author's translation will satisfy us that there is no necessity for doubting the propriety of the received version of the passage.

In the first place this remark is obvious. If "Nebo, or his substitute Mercury, was represented by a plain pillar, consecrated by an unction of sacrifice, the common appellation of which was Baithulia," p. 120, and that it is to a pillar of this sort that Balaam alludes in the word which Mr. Nolan translates "Termini," how does it happen that the word בַּיְתּוּלִיָּה which we find in Genesis, xxvii, 18, 22,

xxxi. 13, xxxv. 14, and in a *great many other places* of the Old Testament, and which is *always* used whenever a pillar or Baithulia is mentioned, should in Numb. xxiv. 17. be written מַסָּבָה , *angulus, latus*?

Mr. Nolan admits that this is the word which Balaam employs, and that the literal meaning of it is given in our received version; why then is it to be translated *Terminus*? Schleusner tells us that the reason why the Septuagint writers, who are followed by

most interpreters, translate it, τὰς ἀρχηγὰς Μωάβ, *princes of Moab*, is, *nempe angulus exterior adificii, quia in utrumvis latus prospectus patet, adificium continet, pro principe, rege vel magnate sumitur.*" This reasoning Mr. Nolan treats with disrespect, approaching to disdain: "the commentators," he says, "are reduced to sad straining to extract the sense of *princes* from the Hebrew word," which, as he fully admits, "according to the literal rendering of the English signifies "corners." He does not, however, affect to say, that any instances can be produced of the meaning which he has affixed, nor that it has any foundation in the Hebrew root. A different sense from his he tells us, "is adopted not only in the Chaldee" but "in the Latin;" the "Syriac also offers a different sense," as likewise "the Samaritan." The "Arabic renders it, *regions*," which is also the sense given to it by "Symmachus." The Septuagint, the Vulgate, and also all the modern versions," agree in thinking differently from our author. All this he admits; the only authority in his favour being that of Pagnini; "who appears to me," he says, "to have expressed more accurately than any of the translators the meaning of this curious passage." We think our readers will smile, at what Mr. Nolan seems to think an approximation to his "*Termini of Moab*:" et transfigo *terminos Moab*," says Pagnini; and we are to understand, it is to be presumed, that the *only* difference between these translations consists in the slight orthographical variety of spelling the same word with a capital in our author's translation, which Pagnini spells with a small initial. If Pagnini's translation be not exactly *the same* as that of Mr. Nolan's, it is not nearer to it than the received version; for "*borders of Moab*" has at least as little relation to *stone column*, "as *corners of Moab*."

It will be evident to our readers, from what has been said, that the reasons for substituting "*Termini of Moab*," in the place of "*corners of Moab*," are founded upon historical considerations and not on philological principles. The real nature of the argument is simply this—I have as much right to say that "*corners of Moab*" is put for *Termini of Moab*," as the Septuagint and other translators have to say, that it means "*Princes of Moab*." And this is true, perhaps, in one sense; but then Mr. Nolan ought to consider, whether it is quite reasonable on his part, to call upon his readers to adopt his single opinion directly in the face of so many and such high authorities as he himself produces.

We have thought it right to examine at some length this part of Mr. Nolan's book, because it is important that our received version should not be unsettled, except on very sufficient reasons. We now come to the argument which he draws from the general

scope and bearing of Balaam's prophecy; and here we think his hypothesis, at first view, rests upon very tenable ground.

"The possibility being admitted, that a prophecy of Jacob might have made its way among his compatriots, the Assyrians; it may be at once raised to a moral certainty, without adducing further proof but that which presents itself in the document before us. Balaam, it has been observed, was of that nation: his prophecy, however, bears internal evidence, that its author was well acquainted with Jacob's prediction. He not only introduces the patriarch expressly by name, but he imitates his prophecy, in its scope, language, and images. As Jacob professes to inform his sons, of what 'shall befall them in *the last days*;' Balaam undertakes 'to advertise Balak what this people should do to his people, in *the latter days*.' As the one declares that '*the sceptre* should not depart from Judah;' the other declares, that '*a sceptre* should rise out of Israel.' In the prediction of each of them, Judah is not only compared to a lion; but their respective descriptions exhibit a circumstantial coincidence, in the imagery and diction, which places the imitation of the prophet beyond controversion. In the patriarch's description, 'Judah is a lion's whelp—he stooped down, he couched as a lion and as an old lion, who shall rouse him up?' in the prophet's, 'he couched, he lay down, as a lion, and as a great lion, who shall rouse him up?' In fine, the bold figure, in which Balaam opens his prediction, does not merely intimate, that he was acquainted with the prediction of Jacob; but presupposes, that his auditors were familiar with the subject. In mentioning Jacob's name, and particularising '*the latter days*,' and '*the sceptre* of Judah;' the prophecy of the patriarch was brought as unequivocally before his hearers, as if it had been expressly quoted. Nor could it admit of any doubt, who the Personage was to whom the prophet alluded, in declaring,

*I shall see Him, but not now,
I shall behold Him, but not near:
A star shall proceed out of Jacob,
A sceptre shall rise out of Israel.*

That it could be Him only, of whom Jacob himself had declared,

*The Sceptre shall not depart from Judah,
Nor a ruler from between his feet,
Until the Pacificator shall come.*"—pp. 118, 119.

This passage is drawn up with much force and ability, and if the reader will compare it with the other which we have extracted from p. 35, he will see that in the two, the ground is laid of a very legitimate hypothesis. Balaam was an Assyrian and a soothsayer; he had been sent for by Balak on account of his supposed fatidical character; and he appears to have known not only the history of the people against whom he was commanded to pronounce a curse, but also to have been acquainted, (at least there is room

for the surmise,) with a very remarkable prophecy concerning the great "Promise" of which they were the depositaries. The question is, can any light be thrown, from other quarters, on these presumptive facts, such as to warrant us in asserting that the knowledge of Balaam was not communicated to him on the spot, either by the Moabites or by divine illumination, but was drawn from previous information possessed by him in common with the rest of his nation?

Our author thinks that he has discovered evidence of a very demonstrative kind, in the etymology of the word Nebô or Nabô, one of the Assyrian deities. The word, he tells us, means "the Prophesied;" we shall present our readers with the proof of this, immediately; but, perhaps, it will not be thought irrelevant in this place, to premise, that we should have thought it more fortunate for his argument, had his reasoning been drawn from the signification of the word Baal, or Chemosh, or Ashtaroth, or any other of the more celebrated eastern idols; inasmuch as it is a question, proposed by Vossius, (*de Idolat. lib. ii. c. 8.*) whether such a deity as Nebô is to be found. Vossius decides in the affirmative, and we have no intention of disputing his decision; but we certainly think the probabilities are very evenly balanced.

The word Nebô occurs in the Old Testament twelve times, as the reader may see by turning to his Concordance. Now in *all these places*, except Isaiah, xvi. 1., it is put for the name of a place, and not of an idol; and in the single passage where it occurs, in this last sense, the Septuagint reads *Δαγών*. To say that this is a false reading for *Ναβαῦ*, is obviously to assume the question; Dagon is the reading found in all the MSS., and was in Jerome's copy. The fair presumption is, therefore, either that Dagon, and not Nebô, was the reading of the Hebrew copies, from which the Septuagint was translated; or else that the translators, knowing of no such god as the last, substituted Dagon as a conjectural emendation. The passage of Isaiah is, "*Bel boweth down; Nebô stoopeth; their idols were upon the beasts, and upon the cattle.*" St. Jerome's note upon this passage is "*Nabo et ipsum idolum est quod interpretatur prophetia, divinatio, quam post evangelii veritatem in toto orbe conticuisse, significat.*" Vossius, who quotes the commentary, subjoins "*quibus et verbis colligo Nebonis oraculum consuli solere, atque hinc esse nominis ejus causam.*" This agrees with Schleusner. "*Ναβαῦ. Ipsa vox Hebraica כבֿוֹ, Jer. xv. 2., quam ἐγκαθισμὸν, scil. τῆς προφητείας, interpretantur.*"

Now although we think it an assumption to say, as Mr. Nolan does, p. 124, that Bel and Nebo were the "*principal gods*" that

were common to the Moabites and Assyrians, yet it would be, we think, to run into the opposite extreme, to affirm that no such god as the last was known to the Septuagint writers. That there is a doubt upon the subject, we certainly hold; but supposing the point to be proved, still we see that in interpreting the word Nabû to mean "the prophesied," we have against us the authorities of St. Jerome, of D. Vossius, and Schleusner, all of whom distinctly understand the word to mean *oraculum*. Mr. Nolan produces no authority except that of Eusebius (of which we shall speak immediately,) in favour of his interpretation; but he does that which in itself is, perhaps, more conclusive: he gives his reasons, drawn from the language itself, for thinking that the proper signification of the word is not *prophecy*, nor the *place* where prophecies were delivered, but, as he says, "The Prophesied."

That the root from which the word is derived means *prophetavit*, is of course admitted; assuming this, his argument is as follows:—

"The name נבו Nebo, or as it is more properly written Nabô, assumes the epenthetical *vau* in its second syllable; as appears from a collation of its orthography in the oriental languages and the western translations, vid. sup. p. 85. n. 187. The verb נבא or נבי from which it is confessedly derived, and which differ only in the common and accidental change of verbs in Lamed-aleph, *naturally* assumes the epenthetical ו, in the past participle, of which it is the characteristic. From Paul נבוא, *prophesied*, has been formed נבו, Naβaû, *Nabo*; by rejecting the variable termination, after the analogy of עשו, 'Hsaû, *Esau*, from the past participle, עשוי, of the verb עשה. Thus Pasor derives the latter name; Etyma. Nom. Nov. Test. sub voc. 'Hsaû, *Esau*, nomen viri. origine Hebræum עשו... עשו vero dicitur q. d. *factus, perfectus*..a radice עשה, *perfectit*."—p. 108, 109.

From our own knowledge of Hebrew, we should be very unwilling to oppose our opinion to that of Mr. Nolan, upon a point of critical learning; but for the same reason, neither do we dare to adopt Mr. Nolan's opinion, standing as it does, opposed to such high authority; particularly as we have had occasion to observe throughout his book, that he is generally very much too anxious to establish his conclusion to be quite as careful and circumspect as he ought to be in the selection of his proof. We have given an instance or two of this already; and an example of the same grave and serious fault occurs in that part of his argument which we are now considering. We said, just now, that the only authority cited by our author in favour of his etymological conjecture, was Eusebius. The value of this authority in the present instance our readers will be able to appreciate.

One part of Mr. Nolan's object is to establish a connexion

between the character of Nebo and the prophecy of Jacob, concerning the future Shiloh. If Nebô means "the prophesied," and Shiloh means "the prophesied," this would furnish a very happy presumption in favour of the preceding argument; but we must state the point in the words of our author.

"If the coincidence be deemed accidental, it must be admitted to be extraordinary, which subsists between the name ascribed by the Assyrians to this deity, and that assigned, by the most learned expositor of prophecy among the ancients, to the Divine Personage to whom Jacob alludes in his prediction. Eusebius, however, conspires with the Assyrians, not merely in rejecting the term Shiloh, and every title into which that term can be explained; but in adopting a name, which is synonymous with Nebo; as literally signifying 'the prophesied,' or 'the foretold.'"—p. 122.

Mr. Nolan, in his note, then refers to Eusebius, from whom he produces the following passage:—"But what is also said after this, 'A prince shall not fail from Judah, nor a ruler from between his feet, until he for whom it is reserved shall come, and to him shall be the expectation of the nations,' seems to me to allude to the times of the appearance of the *Prophesied*, (τὰς χροῖνας ἀντίσδοι μοι δοκεῖ τῆς τῷ Προφητευομένῳ παρυσίας)."

The passage here adduced we have not been able to find, owing, probably, to an error in the reference: for this reason it has not been in our power to verify the quotation. But what can Mr. Nolan mean by saying that Eusebius rejects not merely the term Shiloh, "but every title into which that term can be explained?" Eusebius, according to our author's own translation, evidently adopts the Septuagint interpretation; and are we to understand that this is not one of the titles into which the term Shiloh is to be explained? The words of Genesis are quoted by Eusebius, in Dem. Evang. lib. iii. c. 2, from the Septuagint itself—ἕως ἂν ἔλθῃ ᾧ ἀπόκειται. Speaking, indeed, of the promised Messiah, he uses the word προφητευόμενον, not once, but very many times: we would have our readers to observe, however, that the word is not written with a capital, as if it had been a proper name—"the foretold," "the prophesied," τὸν Προφητευόμενον. This, unless we are very much deceived, is Mr. Nolan's emendation, justified neither by the context, nor by the genius of the Greek language; nor by the Latin translation either of Robert Stephens, Par. 1544, or of Fr. Vigesus, 1628—τί δὲ ποτὲ ἐμποδὼν μὴ ἐκὶ αὐτόν εἶναι φάσκειν τὸν προφητεύομενον—*quid ultra jam impedit ne illum esse dicamus de quo Prophetia extant*: again, a little further on, ἥ εἶναι τὸν προφητευόμενον—*quam is adveniat quem Prophetia significat*.* The word by which Eusebius paraphrases the

* Euseb. Dem. Evang. lib. iii. c. 2.

particular expression of the Septuagint, in the place just quoted, happens to be, not *προφητεύομενον*, but *προσδοκωμένον*: is this also to be written *Προσδοκωμένον*, with a capital, and translated "the Expected?" The case is the stronger against Mr. Nolan, inasmuch as wherever Eusebius talks of "the Prophets," a capital letter is always employed by him; and we may be quite sure that had he used the word "prophesied" substantively, as the title of the Messiah, he would have marked his meaning by a similar mode of writing. As the whole wonder of "the extraordinary coincidence" which our author discovers between his opinion and that of Eusebius, is founded upon what we suppose to be a mere fanciful invention, the curiosity of it will probably not seem so striking to the reader as it does to Mr. Nolan. Neither in this instance, nor in the instance before, of Pagnini's "Termini," do we think that any advantage was to be gained in the argument at all worth the risk of the contrivance, supposing the stratagem to have been used consciously and by design; and, therefore, we quite acquit our excellent author of every suspicion of the kind.

It is said of mathematical studies, that they unfit the mind for the perception of all evidence that is not demonstrative: just the reverse of this appears to be the effect of etymological pursuits; they enable a person to see demonstrative certainty, when the bystanders can see nothing but the merest shadow of an abstract possibility. It was thus that the excellent and truly learned author of the "Origin of Pagan Idolatry" very gravely conjectured that "Robin Hood and his maid Marian" were mere popular transmutations of Buddha and his wife Maya. And Bryant, *venerabile nomen*, having to show that Babel came from Bel, and Babylon from Babel, tells us that the "Confusion of Languages" was not, properly speaking, a "*confusion* of speech," but a "*prevariation* of tongue;" so that when the builders of the Tower meant to say Bel, some stuttered out Ba-al, others Ba-bel, and others again, Ba-by-lon, which last word finally prevailed as the name of the city, where the town of Bel was built. These examples are more than sufficient to shield Mr. Nolan from disrespect, or any severity of criticism, on account of some flights which otherwise might seem to be too adventurous in two or three of his etymological speculations. The conclusion which he has aimed at establishing remains, we think, pretty much where it was before his book was written; but the undertaking itself has merit in the conception, not only as being favourable to revelation, but as marking originality of genius. It has failed, because the proposition to be demonstrated, whether true or false, is not capable, as we think, of proof either way, from the absence of documents. Had the evidence for it existed, we have no doubt that Mr. Nolan's learn-

ing and ingenuity would have been successful in discovering it: as it is, the fault of his book (and, to speak truly, a great fault it is) proceeds from his having attempted to prove more than his materials warranted him in undertaking.

We now take our leave of this elaborate work. There are some subsidiary arguments produced by the author in support of the several points which we have been examining, but which we have passed over, because the propositions themselves being shown not to have a solid foundation, the mere props by which they were strengthened lose their importance. One topic, of a more independent kind, which Mr. Nolan treats at some length, and to which it may be proper to advert, is the tradition that prevailed among the ancient astronomers, or rather astrologers, of some great Restitution, or mundane Regeneration, of which the fourth millennium of the world was to be the era. All that we can say on this point is, that if Balaam, or the ancient Assyrians, expected a "Deliverer" to appear at the period of the world when our Saviour was born, (A. M. 4004,) this expectation could not be founded upon the tradition of prophecy; for the Jews themselves, until the time of Daniel, were left entirely in the dark as to the period when the Messiah was to appear. If founded on any other presumption, (such as the fables of the Chaldee astrologers, for example,) the investigation of its origin has no proper connexion with "The Assyrian Expectations of a Great Deliverer,"

ART. XII.—*Lux Renata: a Protestant's Epistle, with Notes.*

By the Author of *Religio Clerici*. London. Mawman and Rivingtons. 1827. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

NOT many years ago there might have been some reason to believe, that according to the homely allegory of honest John Bunyan, Giant Pope sat bedridden by the side of his deceased friend, Giant Pagan, gnashing his few remaining teeth at the pilgrims as they passed in safety, near his cave. It should seem, however, that, like the treacherous and crawling snake,

"Positis novus exuviis, nitidusque juventâ,"

the reverend senior has renewed his youth in the sunshine of peace, and is creeping about anew, and erecting his crest in search of mischief. Not to dwell upon the circumstances of our own internal history, it is proved amply by the paltry and vexatious tyranny of the Roman see in its domestic regulations, the growing influence and machinations of the bigots and Jesuits of France,

and the detestable atrocities* dragged to light from the dens of the Spanish Inquisition within these seven years, that the spirit of Popery, according to its own motto, is still "semper eadem," and its system of aggression and imposition in full activity. None can attempt to deny that, in the dark ages, its evil was counterbalanced by an equal proportion of good. If with a curious felicity it united the discrepant characteristics of superstitions differing in time and place, if it combined the bootless self-torments and sanctimonious nastiness of the Faquirs and Yoguees, with the human† sacrifices of the Druids, and the pompous mummeries of the classical pagans, (adopted with little or no alteration by the same plastic fiat which turned the Capitoline Jupiter into the Apostle Peter,) it possessed also most of the merits of these respective modes of faith; the zeal of one, the munificence of another, and the brilliancy with which imagination and the arts had invested a third. If in one kingdom alone, thirty-five thousand victims were at different periods burnt alive in honour of the triple-crowned Moloch, the fear of him might also act as a salutary restraint on the secular tyrants to whose warlike propensities such a number of lives would have been but as a mouthful. If Catholicism imposed an oppressive yoke on more tender consciences, it afforded "a bridle for the ass, and a rod for the fool's back." Its task is, however, fairly done, and its day past; and it may be confidently hoped that the present struggles to revive its spirit and maintain its authority are symptoms of approaching dissolution; or, to eke out John Bunyan's similitude by a Scottish phrase, that the giant is "gaun fey." Whether this hope be or be not well-founded, and whether or not the legislature may continue to do its duty as it hitherto has done, it is gratifying to reflect that the Church of England rests on a firmer basis than mere secular authority, that the spirit of the serious and enlightened part of the English nation is awakened to the temporal and spiritual blessings obtained for them by their forefathers, and the precious nature of the deposit with which they are entrusted; that the names of our "noble army of Martyrs" are now "familiar in our mouths as household words;" and that so many men of talent, laic as well as clerical, stand boldly forward to give a reason for the faith which is in them, and court the test of truth and Scripture for their Church, that her deeds may be made manifest. This Mr. Southey has most triumphantly done on a more extended scale than that professed by the author of the poem now

* See Llorente's History of the Inquisition, relative to the punishment of the pendulum, in 1820, &c.

† See Llorente's description of the Quemadero, and the gigantic images of the four Apostles, devoted to the same purpose as the more fragile wicker fabrics of the Druids.

under our notice; who nevertheless, in modestly professing to follow his steps, has illustrated the subject by a vein of vivid imagination and powerful satire; and as his notes will show, has condensed in a poem of between six and seven hundred lines, the pith and marrow of much research in books not generally known.

We must however beg to differ from him in the outset, on his own principle of giving truth fair play and an open field. Agreeing with him as we do, that half an education is worse than none at all, we still anticipate much good and little evil from the inquiring spirit recently awakened among the "lettered rabble," as he unceremoniously styles the better-informed part of the labouring community. As long as the love of relaxation and good beer is natural to man, and Saint Monday continues to occupy a place in the mechanic's calendar, there is strong reason to be sceptical as to any danger of being overrun with Gregorys, Burns's, and Arkwrights, a danger, which one would wish to see existing in reality. But if the spirit in question be alive and effective to any extent, it is both the duty and interest of the privileged orders to rescue their countrymen from the hands of quacks and demagogues, and instead of grudging them the half-education which their limited opportunities allow them to acquire, afford them every facility towards the attainment of a whole one. The ignorance and self-conceit which tend to render men bad Christians, and bad subjects, are best corrected by knowledge sufficient to enable them to appreciate a religion and a social system which triumphantly court the test of inquiry. The only fear is, that they should not know enough.—But a truce to our truisms, and let us follow the main argument of the author, who probably means nothing more than a passing gibe on Dr. Birkbeck's project in its present tadpole state of existence.

Without meddling with the political part of the Roman Catholic question, he proposes to submit the vital principle of Catholicism itself to the test of reason and history:—

"Behold Rome creep along her tangled way,
To-morrow teaching all she taught to-day:
Through the same maze her trodden steps renew,
Still unprogressive, for without a clue.
Confute her doctrines; spite of all your pain,
Their ghosts are never laid, but walk again.
Sever one head; a thousand added grin:
O'erthrow her; keener must the strife begin:
The touch of kindred Earth new strength supplies,
But hold her up to Heaven, the Monster dies."—pp. 53, 54.

In describing the first usurpations of this corrupt branch of the true Catholic Church, he rather bewilders his meaning by follow-

ing Astolfo into the obscure regions of the moon to consult Constantine's pretended charter. Anon, however, he speaks out rather more roundly, and to the purpose:—

“ Much power by Fraud, by Terror more was gained,
This Guilt accorded, Falsehood that obtained.
With lavish hand both Saint and Sinner gave,
One stung by conscience, one to zeal a slave.
Till the proud Harlot, from her seven-fold hill,
Saw prostrate Nations cower beneath her will;
And his broad arms the peaceful Fisher threw,
More wide, AUGUSTUS, than thine Eagles flew.”—p. 13.

The galling humiliation sustained by the Emperor Henry IV., the “ in-and-in breeding” of pontiffs in the days of the Theodoras and Marozias, (if one may apply a harmless agricultural term to the propagation of human brutes,) and the memorable boutade of Julius II. are touched upon each in its turn, in spirited lines which vary their character as the subject varies: and the author proceeds in a stately march of verse descriptive or vituperative, till

“ — the red Idol mounts his guilty state.
Upborn by Murder, Avarice, Lust, and Hate.”—p. 21.

Anticipating next the fancied vindication of Papacy, which some liberal might found upon “ Leo's golden days,” he retorts,

“ Thanks for that name ! Hail days indeed of gold,
Days when Salvation's scrip was bought and sold.”—p. 23.

Now though Leo is rather to be considered as a secular Mæcenas than as a pope, and probably cared as little as Gallio for any question vitally connected with the Catholic faith, yet the opportunity of giving what the fencers call a “ time-thrust” to the supposed argument, is too tempting to be neglected.

The shameless traffic of Tetzels and his gang, still perpetuated in rather a modified shape at the pontifical bazaar, is ably described as tolerated by Leo X. and as opening the eyes of Luther in “ the Goshen of his cell.” The limits of the author's design would perhaps hardly have admitted of an eulogy on the earlier and purer Goshen, existing in the fastnesses of the Alps and Pyrennees; but we should have been better pleased had he devoted a few lines to the commemoration of our own glorious Wicliffe,* to whom Luther may be traced in a direct line of

* It has been well observed by Mr. Southey, that “ it is a reproach to this country that no statue should have been erected in Wicliffe's honour, and that his translation of the Old Testament should never have been printed.” A recent journal has suggested, that the tree celebrated as Wicliffe's Oak, is still standing near Chertsey, in a situation where a new Church would prove a desirable accommodation. If so, we trust the hint will not be wholly lost.

spiritual ancestry. The triumphant life, and peaceful death of the English apostle might have been dwelt upon, (we have no translation of *ευδαιμονίζειν* any more than of *ευθανασία*,) as contrasted with the evil days which his disciples had to encounter, and the fate of Lord Cobham. To Wicliffe might have been equally applied, the following lines on Luther :—

“ Then rose the Warrior, girt his loins with might,
And proved his harness ere he sought the fight :
Truth nerved his breast, his feet the Gospel shod,
Faith was his shield, his sword the Word of God.
Weak against these was Rome’s infuriate train,
And Councils thundered, Cæsars raged in vain.”—p. 24.

We can do no less than quote at length the passage in which the author, with a spirit of candid discrimination, assigns to Henry the Eighth his due estimation as an unworthy instrument in the hands of an overruling Providence, and while he laments over the incalculable loss which learning and the arts sustained in the wanton demolition of the monasteries of this kingdom, affords them due praise as storehouses of effective charity.

“ Thanks for another name, which teaches more,
Than all the Virtues History has in store :
Shews how the hands which Nature’s beam control
Adjust her balance fitly for the whole :
Draw balm from poison, Good sublime from Ill,
And dross from Gold transmute with Chemic skill.
Mysterious agency ! ‘ Free-will is mine,
‘ I cast the seed,’ Man cries, ‘ and I design !’
Cast as you may, a mightier power bestows
The seed’s increase, and reaps it in the close.

“ For what but Heaven itself to goodly end
The tyrant HENRY’S hard-ruled course could bend ?
Or bid an ever-during Temple stand
Based, not on rock, but Passion’s fleeting sand ?
O ! pause awhile where Taste and Learning weep
Above some stately Cloyster’s shattered heap :
O’er Art’s rich stores hurled rudely to decay,
And lettered wealth to Ignorance a prey.
Mourn too with Charity, a holier name,
Mourn those who fed the hungry, nursed the lame ;
Toiled not themselves, but willing need employed ;
The drones are scattered, but the Hive destroyed.
Mark yet one sad and more domestic scene,
A widowed Consort, a disceptred Queen !
See Law to lawless rage her code adjust,
And pandering Conscience hold the masque to Lust !
Yet, when the greatest stroke of Fortune fell,
No gusts of anger in her breast rebel :

Tones of affection through her sorrows ring;
'Tis ' my dear Lord, my husband, and my King!
And on her lips the latest vows expire
For Him whom ' more than all' her ' eyes desire.' "

pp. 24—29.

The subsequent description (from page 30 to 34) of the gradual progress of Gospel truth, will be found inferior to no part of the poem in vigour and imagery; it is, however, rather too long to quote as a whole within our prescribed limits. Due honour is next paid to Edward the Sixth, the Marcellus of newly-reformed England; and a monarch who would probably have rivalled Alfred, had it pleased Heaven to continue his life. Feeling, like that royal sage and patriot, that his days were numbered by mortal disease, and remembering " that the night was coming in which no man might work," Edward seems anxiously to have crowded the labours and charities of a long life into the short span of a few sickly years. We subjoin at length the contrast between the royal children of Catharine and of Jane Seymour.

" O ! lost too early, blessed beyond thine age,
Prince, Patriot, Saint, and Statesman, Child and Sage!
In Thee, Prophetic rapture so foretold,
Sucklings and Babes, the power of God unfold :
From beardless lips rich strains of Wisdom flow,
Unknown to hoary heads and locks of snow.
Though Death, the canker, eat into thy Spring,
Long before ripening Suns the promise bring,
How rich the fragrance which, ere Being fails,
From the crushed blossom Piety exhales !
In yonder guardian walls, fair nurse of Youth,
Who first bade Science minister to Truth ?
Who poured the balm, the pillow smoothed, in those
Where Pain, no longer hopeless, meets repose ?
Who whispered mercy to the Soul's despair,
And oped yon gates for penitence and prayer ?
Go, count what centuries of conquest weigh,
Poised with the few brief years of EDWARD's sway !
" Yet not for Thee, blessed Shade ! must tears be shed,
Fair flower, transplanted to a fitter bed !
Weep we for those who cheerlessly remain
While Night encompasses their Ark again :
And, mocked by visionary Hope's decay,
Gaze on the track of Glory pass'd away.
What scroll is red enough for MARY's name ?
What characters must write it ?—Blood and Flame !
With Faith which purged not, but perplexed the sight,
Too much false Learning ever to be right ;

Sufficient Zeal Life's charities to stem,
 Not to a heavenward channel pilot them;
 With just enough of mother-wit and skill,
 To harden, not correct ungoverned will;
 All Woman's weakness, but that gentle part
 Fitter than Reason's strength to sway the Heart;
 Stern, selfish, melancholy, stubborn, slow,
 Who never spared, nor ever felt a blow.
 Without one failing of a generous mind,
 Which Love may fetter or Ambition blind;
 One touch of fiery-mettled mood, to plead
 The stings of Passion for some headlong deed;
 A nice precision in degrees of Hate,
 And strict the account of Blood to calculate;
 By Rule She butchered, and arranged the stake,
 As her Creed prompted her, for Conscience sake.
 Scanned by her blindness, God himself appears
 Not Love's perfection, but the source of Fears:
 In wrath, not pity, the Redeemer dies,
 And Mercy yields her place to Sacrifice.
 Hence the grim Priestess fancied merit claims
 As each new victim gluts the atoning flames;
 And, while the accursed holocausts ascend,
 Sees Christ, like Moloch, to the banquet bend."—pp. 34—39.

This we think by no means too strong, in opposition to the generally sound maxim of "*de mortuis*," &c. The obstinate and bitter temperament, and the bad qualities of a true Spaniard, appear to have existed in Mary without any alloy of her mother's virtues, or the high-minded and redeeming qualities which characterize her mother's nation. Like the beloved Ferdinand, she derived no wholesome lesson from the early domestic persecution which thwarted and soured her spirit; and as long as one of the same poisonous brood of tyrants and bigots shall exist, her memory ought to be periodically gibbeted in effigy, and cursed "by candle, book and bell," according to due form.

A spirited eulogy on the Martyrs of our Church, during the Marian persecution, and a triumphant description of the final establishment of the Reformed Protestant Religion in England, bring the historical part of the poem down to the time of the Stuarts. A parallel is drawn between the two Charleses, in which the "merry monarch," as it is the fashion to call him, meets with as just reprobation as Henry VIII.

"Behold, the apostate in his shroud, expire,
 False to Himself, his Country, and his Sire!
 Strange fraud! to live without a God, yet die
 Proving e'en this ungodliness a lie."—pp. 47, 48.

In describing the brief ascendancy of Popery during the reign of James II., and the desirable consummation of things to which it speedily led, the author fails not to do justice to the conscientious and independent course steered by Sancroft and his colleagues, the nonjuring Bishops. "We look in vain throughout history," he justly remarks, "for conduct of more disinterested purity;" in truth, no event ever happened reflecting more real dignity on the character of the English Church than the resignation of the five prelates, which we cannot agree with him in styling "a fall."

Having now brought the historical part of his argument to a conclusion, the author sums it thus up—

"So 'mid each change of good and evil days,
Dishonour, glory, persecution, praise,
Whose zeal no triumph slackened, toil dismayed,
Our Sires, in Christ, their goodly platform laid:
And bade their Sons an easier task fulfil,
To guard the rich inheritance from ill.
Is History blank then? long Experience vain?
Has this rough path been trodden without gain?
Draw we no wisdom from the speaking past?
No glance of foresight to the future cast?
Shall all our Temple's glory pass away,
The Rock of Ages shattered in a day?
And while the hot assail, the subtle mine,
Our strength shall drivelling apathy resign?"—p. 52.

Showing next the unchanged nature of the doctrines of the Romish Church, in her present curtailed state of secular power, he gives their due meed to two different classes of her advocates. The Bullaboo, or potatoe, school of eloquence, is laughably described, and the following wholesome caution given to the more virulent of its professors, who cry up their own proposed advancement as the universal nostrum which is to feed and breech their rack-rented countrymen, and cure every other possible ill and grievance which affects, or may affect, the sister isle.

—————"but if stern Hate invade
The couch where suffering and disease are laid;
If factious Malice blast with evil eyes
A Prince for whom a Nation's vows arise;
(Alas! ere finished is the Poet's strain,
A Nation's eager vows arise in vain.)
His shield of weakness from the Fool is torn,
We loathe the reptile whom we did but scorn.
Unchecked, the Zany may his stage ascend,
Display his antics, and his nostrums vend;
One panacea deal for every pang;
But, if the wretch mix poison,—he must hang!"—pp. 55, 56.

The unfortunate remnant are treated with but little ceremony,

“ We pass the rest, a nameless, nibbling fry,
Spawnd but to vent their little dirt, and die.”

Not so nameless, perhaps; but that the noble triton of the fry, callous as a stock-fish to rebuff or castigation, (though unhappily not so dumb,) cannot be specified without a breach of privilege. Probably also the whole of the Blue and Yellow corps, with that fatally-marked personage,

“ The decent priest, where monkies were the gods,”

may be included under this sweeping clause, which however pays rather too great a compliment to the historian in styling him “ Leviathan the Great.”

In the conclusion, the author displays what we think is his characteristic forte; the power of passing at once from the satirical vein into a stately and harmonious march of verse, answerable to the dignity of his subject.

“ True to ourselves, (may Heaven still guard us so,
Unharm'd by specious friend, or open foe!)
Our Ark her charge of holiness may guide
Amid these monsters which beset her side.
From Earth's abyss, though gushing founts arise,
Though Vengeance ope the floodgates of the Skies;
She rides triumphant; while, for many a rood,
Extinct, around her, floats the Giant brood.
And mark, when once again the waters shrink,
And the great deeps, in thirsty channel, drink,
How, moored on Ararat's unshattered crest,
Her keel shall find its solitary rest.
Thence issue forth, Physicians of the Mind,
The Heaven-taught Teachers of renewed Mankind;
From darkling Nations purge their Moral Night,
And bear abroad God's UNEXTINGUISHED LIGHT.”—pp. 62, 63.

As our pen is on the present occasion guided by a lay hand, we cannot be suspected of professional partiality in doing the author the justice which he deserves as a writer, a clergyman, and a gentleman. His talent for pointed and vigorous satire, which we fancy will not be disputed, is rather directed against tenets and measures, than men; and though leading him into personality in one well-deserved instance, appears in no case to be abused to the gratification of private pique and rancour. If at the first glance, some sacred subjects should seem to be somewhat uncereimoniously treated, no candid person will suspect the author of a tendency to levity or indecorum: and though in his zeal he ap-

pears to snatch the sacred ark roughly from profane hands, he shows in the next moment, that he can himself bear it with due reverence and dignity.

Of his style we approve as much as of his matter. The standard English couplet, which he wields with the ease of a practised hand, has of late fallen much into disuse, partly perhaps from the chilling example of dull didactics, partly from the brilliant success of the romantic school of Poetry, and partly from the originality affected by succeeding generations of songsters. In the present state of the times, it is difficult to say what may or may not be considered as verse, which even in some not unpopular works, hops and flounders about with the gait of a mutilated frog. We are therefore pleased to see that there are persons among us who prefer shooting in the bow of Ulysses, or as we may rather call it without danger of misinterpretation, the old British long-bow; handed down from Chaucer to Dryden and Pope; and though easy to play with in mock contest, requiring a nervous arm to draw it to the arrow head with effect. We need not remark with what tremendous practical effect it has been employed by Pope and Gifford, Churchill and Byron; by the two latter sometimes in fair contest, sometimes in merciless random shots. We shall leave our readers to judge whether the author of *Lux Renata* has not drawn this weapon to the head with kindred vigour, and at all events in a worthier and higher cause.

ART. XIII.—*The Lord Mayor's Visit to Oxford, in the Month of July, 1826.* Written at the desire of the Party, by the Chaplain to the Mayoralty. London. Longman & Co. 1826. Post 8vo.

FEW more splendid exhibitions of successful enterprize have been displayed in the History of Mankind, than that mighty Civic peregrination, which has immortalized the memory of the late excellent Chief Magistrate of London, and has been accurately recorded in the little volume before us, by his faithful spiritual adviser. The State voyages of the *Prætor Urbanus*, hitherto, have been circumscribed between Blackfriars and Westminster; from the former of which, he has been used to embark, in the glory of incipient sovereignty, amid the vociferous shouts of light-hearted apprentices, rejoicing in their holiday, and the solemn aspirations of more sober Common-councilmen, whose dinners depended upon the safety and punctuality of his return. Or, yet farther, under the

clear blue sky of Summer, his gilded vessel has glided in gallant trim, the Water-Bailiff at the helm and a carved Triton at the prow, over smooth and unruffled shallows, to the Thule of the Twickenham meadows, by the banks of which the *Maria Wood* is laid up in *Ordinary*. But the labours of Francklin and of Parry have not been lost upon the enlightened Citizens of London. Fired with the strong contagion of discovery, they have conceived and executed an expedition, both by water and on *Terra firma*; and have extended to a far wider range than Pope contemplated when he sang them, their Cimon-like triumphs "over land and wave." One has filled the Civic throne who has ridden, in his private State carriage, from the Mansion House to the Town Hall at Oxford; and has been rowed back again, in his public State barge, on the bosom of the Thames, in all the majesty and magnificence of a Fluviatile and Potamophilous Lord Mayor.

Happily such energy has met its due reward; and it will not be lost to posterity, *caret quia Vate SACRO*. The Chaplain of the Mayoralty has accepted the office of Historiographer; and he has performed its duties to admiration. Never yet did there exist any Annalist, who so fully comprehended the scope of the subject which he was destined to record, or who, in all respects, possessed talents so nicely adapted to its correct representation. Most unfeignedly do we rejoice that his Ministerial calling permits us to include his Work within the pale of our exclusive criticism; and we can assure those readers who are least inclined to deviate from the strict course of Theological study, in the words of the judicious Chaplain himself, that although this "species of writing is not altogether in accordance with the sacred profession of which the writer is the unworthiest member," yet that, not any thing will he found in his pages "at all injurious to the interests of Piety."

Some persons indeed may imagine that it would not have been easy so to frame this narrative as that Piety, in any way, should suffer from it. But this is not our concern; and Mr. Chaplain Dillon can himself judge better of his powers and opportunities of offence, than we can do for him. In order to keep on the safe side, we shall offer as much of his narrative as we can, precisely in his own language.

Early in 1826, it had been determined to connect the assertion of the Lord Mayor's prerogative, as Conservator of the River Thames, as far as the City Stone, near Staines, with an Excursion to Oxford. The train of ideas which led to this not very obvious association is no where explained: perhaps it might arise from the words "London" and "University" having, of late, crept

closer than usual together. Scarcely had this resolution been finally agreed to, before Fame, with her myriad tongues, bruited it abroad at Oxford; and a pleasing embarrassment was created between the two Corporations, by the ardour of rival hospitality—but at length the preliminary Gastronomic arrangements were satisfactorily completed, and it was agreed, after an interchange of deipno-diplomatic correspondence, which Mr. Dillon has printed verbatim, that the Lord Mayor of London and his suite should dine with the Mayor and Magistrates of Oxford on the 25th of July, and that the Mayor and Magistrates of Oxford should dine with the Lord Mayor of London on the following day.

Di immortales!

Quanta pernis pestis veniet! quanta labe larido!

Quanta summi absumedo! quanta callo calamitas!

Quanta laniis lassitudo! quanta porcinariis!

On the memorable 25th of July, the Progress accordingly began. Mr. Alderman Atkins, accompanied by two of his daughters, Miss Atkins and Miss Sarah Jane, left his seat, Halstead Place, in Kent, for London on the preceding evening, and set off in the cool of the following morning for Oxford. On the same day Mr. Alderman and Mrs. Lucas, with their daughters Miss Charlotte and Miss Catherine, left their house, at Lea, in Kent, and went by land to Boulter's Lock, near Maidenhead, where they embarked on board the Navigation shallop for Reading; whence their carriage conveyed them the remainder of their journey. For the Great Magistrate himself thus speaks his official Chronicler.

“The private state-carriage, drawn by four beautiful bays, had driven to the door at half-past seven. The coachman's countenance was reserved and thoughtful; indicating full consciousness of the test by which his equestrian skill would this day be tried, in having the undivided charge of four high-spirited and stately horses,—a circumstance somewhat unusual; for, in the Lord Mayor's carriage, a postilion usually guides the first pair of horses. These fine animals were in admirable condition for the journey. Having been allowed a previous day of unbroken rest, they were quite impatient of delay; and chafed and champed exceedingly on the bits by which their impetuosity was restrained.

“The murmur of expectation, which had lasted for more than half an hour, amongst the crowd who had gathered around the carriage, was at length hushed by the opening of the hall-door. The Lord Mayor had been filling up this interval with instructions to the *femme de ménage*, and other household officers, who were to be left in residence, to attend, with their wonted fidelity and diligence, to their respective departments of service during his absence, and now appeared at the door. His Lordship was accompanied by the Lady Mayoress, and followed by the Chaplain.

"As soon as the female attendant of the Lady Mayoress had taken her seat, dressed with becoming neatness, at the side of the well-looking coachman, the carriage drove away; not however, with that violent and extreme rapidity, which rather astounds than gratifies the beholders; but at that steady and majestic pace, which is always an indication of real greatness.

"Passing along Cheapside and Fleet Street,—those arteries, as Dr. Johnson somewhere styles them, through which pours the full tide of London population,—and then along the Strand and Piccadilly, the carriage took the Henley road to Oxford.

"The weather was delightful; the sun, as though it had been refreshed by the copious and seasonable showers that had fallen very recently, seemed to rise more bright and clear than usual, and streamed in full glory all around. The dust of almost a whole summer had been laid by the rain; the roads were, of consequence, in excellent order; and the whole face of creation gleamed with joy."—pp. 11—13.

As the Civic party approached Hounslow, an explosion took place at the Powder Mills, upon which Mr. Dillon, not unaptly, moralizes. When they reached Cranford Bridge "which is about thirteen miles from Hyde Park Corner," another portion of the party arrived there simultaneously in a chaise; after an interchange of salutations, the Lady Mayoress, observing that they must be somewhat crowded, invited one of them to occupy the fourth seat in her own carriage, "as the day was beginning to be warm, this courteous offer of her Ladyship was readily accepted."

At a quarter past three Oxford was in view, and Mr. Dillon describes his own feelings on entering that city. "You feel," he says—but we must pass on from sentiment to action. A deputation awaited the Lord Mayor at the Star Inn, "congratulating themselves" (and doubtless *him* also) "that only another hour lay between them" and "dinner." At a quarter before seven (a somewhat long single *hour* for hope deferred) the company, five-and-twenty in number, sat down "to a banquet of such a grand and costly nature, as seemed to indicate that the whole neighbouring country had been put in requisition." The Grace cup passed—appropriate Toasts were given—Speeches were made, from one of which we apprehend that Mr. Dillon's Work will provoke a generous emulation on the part of his Hosts: for the Town Clerk of Oxford, in returning thanks for the honour which the company had done him in drinking his health, said that "if it ever fell to his province to write a History of the City of Oxford, he should record the occurrence of this day as an epoch in its annals." This registry of great events by the respective agents of the different leaders concerned in them, is not without the authority of high precedent. When the two Monarchs of England and France met on the Field of Cloth of Gold, at Ardres, Francis,

on the one part, commanded Monsieur Peyresc to compose a Journal of the interview, while Henry, on the other, committed a similar task to the pen of Hall his Recorder.

It was nearly midnight before the company separated. The Chief Magistrate of Oxford throughout the evening manifested that "easy politeness which in an instant supersedes the preliminaries of previous acquaintance, and seems scarcely to require intercourse to strengthen or time to improve it;" and the conversation

"in the intervals of the several Toasts, though naturally of a desultory and general nature, was yet such as to show that good taste, good feeling, and good sense, are by no means limited" (as Mr. Dillon appears before that to have believed) "to the Citizens of the Metropolis."

The following morning commenced with a breakfast, upon which, it is evident, that Mr. Dillon yet lingers with a longing look of recollection;

"the tea and coffee," he remarks, "were accompanied not only with bread, warm and cold, in the shape of loaves, cakes and biscuits, with other varieties, and butter," (shade of Lord Ogleby! 'Hot rolls and butter in the month of July!') "but with every delicacy with which the morning meal, when sumptuously provided, is usually furnished."

The party then proceeded to *lionize*, under the pilotage of the Master of Pembroke Hall. The Kitchen at Christ Church, very naturally, was an object of strong attraction; but it appears to have disappointed expectation; save only so far as regards

"a large old curious gridiron, apparently about four feet square, used in former times for dressing whole joints, before ranges and spits were invented."

In the Theatre of Anatomy they received higher gratification. Professor Kidd (than whom an abler and a better man does not exist) exhibited a series of preparations "so elegantly constructed as in no degree to offend the delicacy of the most refined female;" and among the first which he offered for inspection, "was a portion of the alimentary canal of the Turtle." We cannot sufficiently admire the nicety of tact which thus almost instinctively accommodated things to persons. The learned Professor would not have sought to detain any but Testudinivorous visitors from viewing the other wonders in his seat of the Muses, by venturing *Χελώνην Πηγάσῳ συγκρίνειν*.

Dr. Kidd very liberally concluded by repeating, gratuitously, that which (as far as we can judge from Mr. Dillon's report of it) is his Second Lecture on Comparative Anatomy. After this the party, jaded and hungry, in consequence of the long interval

which had clapsed since breakfast, returned to luncheon. The tour of curiosities, however, was renewed, by such as were not too weary, at the close of this "intermediate repast," and continued until the near approach of the dinner hour warned them to make becoming alteration in their dress.

"The hour of six had scarcely arrived, when the company, invited by the Lord Mayor to dine with him at the Star, began to assemble. The city watermen, in their new scarlet state liveries, were stationed in the entrance hall; and a band of music was in attendance, to play on the arrival of the visitors. In a large drawing-room, on the first floor, fronting the street, on a sofa at the upper end, sat the Lady Mayoress, accompanied by Mrs. Charles Venables, and surrounded by the other ladies of the party. The City Marshal of London, Mr. Cope, dressed in full uniform, and carrying his staff of office in his hand, took his station at the door, and announced the names of the guests as they severally arrived. Near the entrance of the room also stood Mr. Beddome, in a richly wrought black silk gown, carrying the sword downwards. The Lord Mayor, who was in full dress, and attended by his chaplain in clerical robes, wore on this occasion the brilliant collar of S.S;—an honour belonging to the Lord High Chancellor,—the Lord Chief Justice of England,—and to the Chief Magistrate of London."—pp. 58, 59.

"When dinner was announced, the party, amounting to nearly sixty persons, each gentleman taking charge of a fair partner, descended to a long room on the ground floor."—p. 61.

"When the Chaplain, by craving a blessing on the feast, had set the guests at liberty to address themselves to the dainties before them; and the room was illuminated throughout by a profusion of delicate wax candles, which cast a light as of broad day over the apartment; it would not have been easy for any eye, however accustomed to look on splendour, not to have been delighted, in no common manner, with the elegance of the classic and civic scene now exhibited in the dining-parlour of the first inn in Oxford."—pp. 62, 63.

"The conversation naturally assumed that tone best qualified for the discovery of those talents and learning, of which the evening had drawn together so select and bright a constellation."—p. 63.

"The ladies, who, to the great gratification of the company, had sat longer than is usual at most tables, at length obeyed the signal of the Lady Mayoress, and retired to the drawing-room—

‘With grace,
Which won who saw, to wish their stay.’

The conversation was, however, in no degree changed in their absence. The Lady Mayoress and her fair friends had taken their share in it with much good sense and delicacy; and their departure, so far from being succeeded by that obstreperous and vulgar merriment, or any thing like that gross profligacy of conversation, which indicates rejoicing at being emancipated from the restraint of female presence, only gave occasion to the Magistrates of Oxford to express their wish, that, in the invitations

to their corporation dinners, arrangements could be made that would include the ladies.

"There can be no question that the influence which well-educated and amiable females have upon society is immense. Among other important effects which it produces, it prevents that conversational mannerism which is otherwise found to characterize the social intercourse of men; and it promotes the observance of those little courtesies, on which so much of the comfort of life unquestionably depends."—pp. 64, 65.

We remember to have seen the last remark of Mr. Dillon very ably supported and illustrated in the singularly edifying Tractate of the Jesuit Theophilus Raynaud, *De sobriâ alterius Sexûs frequentatione per Religiosos viros*.

While the morning of the 26th was yet early, the busy note of preparation announced the approaching departure of the Visitors. The State Barge and Navigation Shallop were already at their moorings.

"In another large boat, half covered with an awning, was his Lordship's Yeoman of the Household, who had charge of the provisions for the Lord Mayor's party; together with the Cook, who was, at the time of embarkation, busily engaged in preparing a fire.

"At a quarter after seven, amidst shouts of reiterated applause from the surrounding multitudes, the City Barge, manned by the city watermen, in scarlet liveries, and all the other boats in attendance on his Lordship, were simultaneously launched on the broad bosom of the princely Thames.

"The immense tide of population which had rolled forth from the city, flowed along with the boats a considerable distance, on both sides of the river; and extreme delight was visible in every countenance. The weather, indeed, was of itself sufficient to give rise to joyous and happy feelings. The rays of a bright sun, streaming through an unclouded sky, poured their enlivening influence all around. It was quite one of those genial mornings, when we seem to draw in delight with the very air we breathe, and to feel happy, we can scarcely tell why."—pp. 70, 71.

At about nine the boats reached Nuneham, but the crew passed it without a glance, being "unitedly engaged in the elegant cabin of the State Barge, in doing honour to the delicacies of the Lord Mayor's breakfast table." As they proceeded, the whole population of the neighbouring villages poured out to greet them, and the Lord Mayor, assisted in his benevolent task by Mr. Alderman Atkins, scattered handfulls of halfpence among the children who thronged the banks. "It was gratifying to see the absence of selfish feeling manifested by some of the elder boys, who, forgetful of themselves, collected for the younger girls;" and this pretty gallantry affords Mr. Dillon another fair opportunity (and in justice to him it must be admitted that he never neglects

them) of moralizing on "smiles," "wine and oil," the "glow of gratitude," and "the fountain of indwelling delight."

Wallingford was the scene of Dinner,—the Bear Inn at Reading that of Supper and Sleep. That of the following Breakfast is not recorded. At *Henley* Mr. Alderman Birch called to the recollection of the party the beautiful lines in which Denham has characterized the Thames at *Cooper's Hill*. The quotation was, perhaps, somewhat premature, and burst from the teeming Alderman many miles before his arrival at the point of seasonable parturition; but Poetry is like bottled beer, and when it once begins to effervesce, it is difficult to hinder it from finding vent at its own pleasure. In the grounds of Cliefden a select party was invited to partake of a rural dinner with the Civic train; and, in order to gratify the intense curiosity of the assembled gazers, the female part was admitted to walk round the tables at which the company was seated. The honest peasantry strained their eyes and pointed their fingers at the Lord Mayor, who was now in his native parish, or near it; and half-suppressed sentences could occasionally be distinguished—"He was born in our village"! Hereon, as might be expected, Mr. Dillon is more than usually pathetic.

By a very natural transition, the learned Chaplain here proceeds to contrast the character of Augustus with that of George III.; and, while he is so doing, the boats glide on, the clock strikes eleven, and the party falls asleep at Windsor. A visit to the Castle occupied the following morning; and Mr. Dillon has catalogued the Pictures and Apartments with scrupulous fidelity. But we hasten on to the City Stone at Staines, in order to arrive at which the Lord Mayor had travelled to and from Oxford. This venerable monument stands in a meadow at no great distance from the water-side, and bears date A.D. 1285. A procession was marshalled, which walked three times round at a considerable distance; the Sword of State was placed upon it,—the City Banner waved over it,—a Bottle of Wine was broken on it as a libation,—and an Inscription, recording the visit of the Lord Mayor, was ordered to be engraven on its pedestal.

This ceremonial has been illustrated by an Engraving, in which portraits of the principal characters assisting in it are introduced; the Lady Mayoress is smiling and sebaceous,—the Lord Mayor is erect, attentive, and adipose,—and behind him is a figure which, even without the aid of its sacerdotal vestments, we should instantly recognize for the author of this narrative,

"Such gentle touches wanton o'er his face."

With this solemnity ended the interest of the voyage. At

Richmond every one, with a "countenance deeply imbrowned by long exposure to the sun and air," took leave of the Lord Mayor and Lady Mayoress, and returned to his respective home. The Chief Magistrate himself reached his Civic Palace at a few minutes before ten.

Mr. Dillon concludes his Log Book by answering a *cui bono* question. We must give this reply in his own words; at the same time not concealing a shrewd suspicion which we entertain that the devout Chaplain has transplanted it from the peroration of his favourite sermon.

"This little narrative, then, will not have been written entirely in vain, if it shall at all contribute to remind the respected individuals whose names have been mentioned on its pages,—that even if such delightful parties could continue always, and they could dwell together thus harmoniously for the full season of this mortal life; yet that, after a few more years at most, the grave would close its gates between them,—that every page will, ere long, be torn from the volume of every one's life,—and all will have passed away.

"If, however, they shall diligently seek,—and there is but one way,—to be included in *the general assembly and church of the first-born, whose names are written in heaven*,—then, though they may chance to pass whole weeks, whole months, and, it may be, whole years, without seeing or knowing any more of each other;—and though death may at last break the bond of their society on earth,—yet, like the waters of that ample stream which has recently borne them so pleasantly along,—separated, for a short time, by the piers of an intervening bridge,—they shall ultimately meet again, in that more perfect state of being, where there shall be neither absence nor interruption; where death is never known, and friends are never parted."—pp. 156, 157.

For ourselves, in conclusion, we cannot but lament that the triple triumphs of Whittington, and the duple dignities of Wood, should have failed to meet with a similar Chronicler. We trust, however, that every future Monarch of Guildhall, whether he proceeds in full Civic pomp to Smithfield, for the proclamation of Bartholomew Fair, or more familiarly visits Greenwich to ingurgitate Whitebait, will intrust the record of those occurrences to the pen of his Chaplain for the time being. So may these great events of his magistracy, which, otherwise, might be fleeting and forgotten, become, as it were, *κτίματα ἐς αἰ*, and be ingrafted on the main stock of ever-during and imperishable History.

ART. XIV.—*A Sermon, preached in the Cathedral Church of Chester, on Sunday, November 5, 1826.* By Edward Copleston, D.D., Dean of Chester, and Provost of Oriel College, Oxford. London, Murray; and Rivingtons. Oxford, Parker. 1826. pp. 36.

THE frequent, and apparently successful, use which is commonly made of the *argumentum ad verecundiam* in the discussion of the Roman Catholic Claims, has often struck us as something surprising. If ever there was a case in which the argument of authority would seem to be decisive against any set of opinions, it is against the opinions of those who advocate the concession of those claims. No one would think of deferring to the prejudices of the clergy in a question of law or physic, or even of mere state policy, as opposed to the concurring sentiments of lawyers and physicians and statesmen; but surely, in a question involving the interests of religion in general, and especially of the Established Church, the opinions of the clergy must be considered, if not of paramount, yet, at least, of the very highest authority.

The Ministers of the Church of England contend that the maintenance of a Protestant Establishment is essential to the existence of true religion in this country; and they further believe, that the admission of Roman Catholics into the legislature would endanger the security of this establishment;—on this point they are unanimous to a degree which is almost without example. This, no doubt, is matter of opinion, but it is a subject on which the clergy are in an especial manner called upon to give their judgment; and backed as that judgment is, in the present instance, by the voice of the immense majority of the people of England, to say that the weight of authority, under such circumstances, is in favour of removing the disabilities which the wisdom of our ancestors found it necessary to impose upon those who belonged to the communion of the Church of Rome, is, we think, a most unaccountable assumption. If the argument were merely as to the effect of such a measure upon the civil liberties of the people, or upon our relations with foreign states, the authority of Burke and Pitt, and Fox and Windham, and of other names which we are disposed to respect, would no doubt possess the greatest weight. But the question is as to the effect of the measure upon the interests of the Established Church and of the Protestant Religion; and here, we presume to say, that we can produce, not one, but a hundred names, any one of which, according to the usual rules by which the value of authority is estimated, will more than counterbalance the weight that can pro-

perly belong to the evidence of mere statesmen, be they ever such able politicians.

The name of Dr. Copleston alone, in such a question, carries with it no light importance; and we congratulate the friends of pure religion upon being able to add his public testimony in support of the same views as have been taken of this much agitated question by almost every distinguished member of the Church. We say nothing of the acknowledged learning of Dr. Copleston, nor of his confessedly superior understanding—cultivated as it has been by meditation, and by an acquaintance both with theology and with philosophy beyond most of his contemporaries. That which gives this sermon its peculiar value, is the well known character of its author, as a person who forms his own opinions upon every subject, and never comes to any important conclusion except when he has himself examined the premises from which it is to be drawn. It is, therefore, with singular pleasure that we introduce to our readers the able and polished production which is prefixed to this article. It was preached in the Cathedral of Chester, on the 5th of November, and has been published at the request of the Bishop and Prebendaries of that Church. The circumstance of its not having been designed for publication would of course be an apology for any defects of a literary kind which it might display; but it stands in need of no such apology; on the contrary, we can sincerely recommend it to our readers almost as a standard tract. There are some remarks which it contains that are, we believe, entirely original; and the whole design of the argument is to exemplify a very important truth, which, if not strictly new, is placed in a new light, and is, moreover, one which it particularly behoves us to remember in the present day, when the religious animosities, that had been laid asleep during the last half century, would appear to be reviving in Europe.

The text is taken from John, xvi. 2. "The time cometh, when whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service." The immediate instruction which Dr. Copleston endeavours to build upon the passage of Scripture in which this text is found, is to point out the tendency which has been displayed in every age of the Christian Church, among those possessed of spiritual authority over mankind, to found upon this authority a claim to temporal dominion. The root of this corruption must be sought in human nature itself; but the argument on which it has always been justified is drawn from the Old Testament. Accordingly this is the first point to which our attention is directed; and the fallacy of the reasoning on which ambitious men have attempted to found a Christian Kingdom upon earth, by pleading the ex-

ample of the Jewish hierarchy, is admirably refuted and explained. The Jewish law was built immediately upon the authority of God, having the maintenance of that authority for its exclusive object. To violate religion therefore, among the Jews, was to transgress against the state; blasphemy, among them, was the same as treason is among us, and, in perfect consistency with the whole spirit of their institutions, was to be punished in the same way. But the abrogation of this union between the secular and the spiritual offices of the state is the very essence of Christianity; and to endeavour to join them together, either in the same persons or under the same sanctions, is to destroy the very foundation on which Christ's Kingdom is built.

"Yet strongly marked as the contrast thus is between the Jewish and the Christian dispensations, the one being professedly a kingdom of this world, and the other, in the person of its divine Founder, expressly disclaiming all pre-eminence of that kind, it is indeed most remarkable in the history of Christ's Church, how soon corruptions sprang up, which clearly had their origin in the love of temporal greatness, and the desire to substitute a Christian kingdom upon earth corresponding with that Jewish hierarchy whose ordinances had been swallowed up in the Gospel. So powerful is the allurements of earthly splendour and dominion, that the disposition was early manifest to assimilate the Christian worship to the ancient Hebrew ritual. I speak not now of that lingering attachment to their old religion which many of the earliest Jewish converts exhibited, but which wore itself out almost within the age of the apostles. The retrograde tendency to which I refer was not the *remnant* of Judaism, but the gradual growth of a corrupt nature under the specious pretence of a zeal for God's service, and of respect for his laws. Its origin was manifestly independent of all connexion with former habits; for it prevailed most, not in the Eastern provinces, where if such had been its source we should naturally expect to find it, but in the remoter region of the West, where the see of Rome had early acquired an ascendancy, as a pattern and authority in points of practice for other Churches.

"It is curious to trace the studied imitation in the pomp of their public worship, in the dress of their priests, copied from Aaron's vestments, in the use of oil, and of incense, and of holy water for lustration, in the frivolous distinction of meats and of days, and at length in that grand corruption of doctrine, the parent of a thousand others, that Christ is offered up as a sacrifice by the priest every time his death is commemorated by the solemn participation of bread and wine according to his own institution. Then, too, came the practice of calling the communion table by the name of altar: and there, instead of thankfully remembering the one oblation of himself once made by Christ upon the cross, their priests stood daily offering up their victim, like the priests of the Jewish temple, as an atonement for the sins of the people.

"Last of all was avowed, with unblushing boldness, the claim of a Christian bishop to the dominion of the earth—a claim advanced in the

name of Him, and as the servant of Him, who declared that his kingdom was not of this world. Upon this claim naturally followed all the ordinary expedients which earthly governments employ to compel obedience, and to punish rebellion. The purity of the faith was to be maintained by terror, by torture, by sanguinary executions; and men were taught to put their fellow-creatures to death as an act well-pleasing to God, and even beneficial to the unhappy sufferer himself."—pp. 10-13.

Dr. Copleston then proceeds to remark, how inveterately this disposition, above referred to, is rooted in mankind; instancing examples of it in the Protestant as well as in the Papal Church; and drawing from such examples matter of well-grounded caution, especially to those who are placed in the situation of Ministers of the Gospel. The passage in which this salutary precaution is expressed, is conveyed in language which could not be misunderstood in any times except the present; in order to prevent any mistake, however, as to his true meaning, as if he thought that in this respect all religions were alike, he quickly subjoins a remark pointing out a fundamental distinction between the Church of Rome, and those who have separated from her.

"Let me not however be misunderstood. If it be a legitimate object, as I certainly hold it to be, of civil government, to maintain and establish the purest form of Christianity, it must in candour be allowed to the bishops and pastors of that Church to feel a livelier interest and a prompter zeal in its defence than can be expected from the generality of its lay members. By their education moreover they are frequently enabled to understand more correctly, and to explain more clearly to others, the grounds and the utility of a religious establishment, than thousands of their fellow-subjects among whom they live. If therefore, upon the prospect of danger, they appear foremost in giving the alarm, if in case of observing a culpable indifference to such things, they endeavour to conquer the apathy, to awaken the attention, to enlighten the mind, or to direct the judgment of their neighbours, they cannot with reason be said to exceed their province, or to abuse their sacred office. But the truth unquestionably is, that in this country the public mind is too apt to be violently excited upon such questions; and the duty of a minister of religion much more frequently consists in softening prejudices and animosities, and in allaying the heat of party feeling, than in stimulating the minds of men to an active and eager interest in them.

"In reminding you however of the share which even Protestant Churches have had in the guilt of persecution, it is necessary to point out a material distinction between our case and that of the Church of Rome. The duty or the right of persecution we no longer assert. It never did form a part of our public professions. And now that our eyes are opened and our minds better informed, we not only disclaim it, but condemn it. We lament the errors of our forefathers, and we teach our children to avoid the same mistaken course, as being offensive to God, and in direct disobedience to the commands of our Saviour.

"In behalf of the Church of Rome the same thing cannot be said : nor indeed with the pretensions of that Church to infallibility is the plea possible. Individuals we know there are among them, composing perhaps the great majority of that communion, who lament, and reprobate, and abhor persecutions : but it is not with individuals that we are concerned : it is with the Church of Rome itself ; and that Church neither has abandoned the claim, nor, however it may have disapproved the exercise of it in any particular case, has it ever condemned—it never can condemn the principle—for by so doing it would condemn the very principle upon which its own arrogant pretensions to preeminence and universal rule are founded."—pp. 16—18.

What defensive measures may be required, in any Protestant state, to guard against the evils that may arise from the toleration of a religion such as that of Rome, Dr. Copleston omits to consider, as not forming a proper subject of consideration from the pulpit. But he concludes with a recommendation of some serious advice to all who interest themselves in the discussion of the question in the present day ; and which, for the wisdom it contains, as well as for the earnest eloquence with which it is expressed, deserves to be imprinted upon the hearts and understandings of all who possess any influence either in church or state, in parliament or in the country.

"But if such be the caution requisite for those who think some restraints upon our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects essential to our own security, still graver is the duty of those who seek to remove them altogether, and still more solemn should be the warning addressed to *them*, not to bend religion to their political views ; not to represent the difference as slight or unimportant between the pure doctrines of our Church and that spurious mixture of fraud, of fable, of priestcraft and superstition, with which the Church of Rome has corrupted and overlaid the Gospel. To know what the doctrines of that Church really are, we must seek them in countries where her sway is undisputed, and her spiritual darkness not illumined by any friendly ray issuing from the brighter bodies that surround it. It is in this way we reason upon all other subjects. If for instance we are desirous of learning the genuine properties of any material substance, which is commonly found in contact or in combination with others, we carefully separate, as far as we can, the foreign ingredients, and think we ascertain the true character of the body we are considering, in proportion as we examine it in its insulated and independent state. Let the same test be applied to the Romish Church ; and we shall find that precisely as its characteristic tenets have prevailed, the spirit of real Christianity has declined. Her policy has ever been to keep the people in blind subjection to the priesthood : and as ignorance and superstition and imposing ceremonies have always been the readiest means of accomplishing this purpose, so has that Church not scrupled to employ them, according to the power she possessed, till at length the religion of Christ has been made to resemble a political machine, or a

heathen pageant, instead of being the guide of men's lives, and the source of hope and holy comfort to their souls, through faith in the merits of their Redeemer.

"If the false estimate I allude to of the difference between the Protestant and the Romish faith arise from inattention or from ignorance, we must pity either the want of information, in matters concerning which it is so easily to be obtained, or the want of power to discriminate between things really so different in their own nature. But if from any selfish or any worldly motive this representation is ever made, if party spirit, or a love of popularity, or a foolish desire of being thought liberal, or a dread of popish vengeance, or a mean subserviency to the political views of others—if these or any one of these motives possess the heart, and incline it to prevaricate in so sacred a cause, deep indeed is the guilt of that man, and flagrant the insult offered to the Majesty of Heaven. But let not any one, as he values the honour of God and the peace and salvation of his own soul, let him not burden his conscience with a sin so grievous. Let him not thus provoke the righteous judgment of God. It is a wilful sacrifice of divine truth to worldly feelings and worldly interests. And as the Almighty rejected Saul from being king over Israel, when he presumed to make religion subordinate to his schemes of policy, so will Christ reject those from a share in his kingdom, who are ashamed or afraid under any circumstances to confess him before men, or who think that any object upon earth can be so important as to justify a compromise of the pure word of God in order to obtain it."—pp. 22—25.

We make no apology to our readers for the length of these extracts. The name and reputation and rank of Dr. Copleston in the Church will give them an interest with our readers. But the passages which we have selected require no extrinsic recommendation of this sort. Independently of their beauty as specimens of composition, the force of reasoning they display, and the importance of the subject to which they relate, will ensure them the attention they deserve. We cannot, however, close our remarks without extracting one passage more, which is to be found in the notes appended to the Sermon. Dr. Copleston is speaking of the undue authority attached by some persons to the declarations of individuals among the Roman Catholics disavowing the opinions with which they are charged as a body; and the contempt with which their opponents are treated, when they produce the evidence of history, in every age of the Romish church, from the tenth century to the present, as a justification of the scepticism with which such declarations of individuals ought to be received. The remark of Dr. Copleston on this subject is admirable.

"And here I cannot but admire the course of reasoning which many of the advocates of the Roman Catholics have pursued, even when arguing in their capacity as statesmen a point of practical policy. With such men, one would think, the evidence of history and the testimony

of facts would carry more weight than the most explicit declarations upon paper of the present and still more of a remote age. But when the language of disavowal comes not from the fountain head, when it is merely the fine-spun distinction of some theologian or casuist, commenting upon the disputed text in which the real authority lies; when this subtle interpretation, be it sound or be it not, yet is produced as an acute solution of a difficulty felt by Romanists themselves, and is recommended as useful to the study of their own divines; when, I say, this single argument is placed in one scale against the overpowering weight of historical evidence joined to the avowed doctrine of their most approved expositors, Bossuet and Bellarmine, on the other, I am at a loss to conceive how such men can have yielded up their judgment to such a process of reasoning.

“ Let us for a moment suppose the case to have been inverted—that the evidence of facts was on the side of the Roman Catholics, and that their adversaries produced not so much as an antiquated dogma of confessed authority, but the *interpretation* only of such a dogma by some learned casuist—and that this interpretation gave to it a force contradictory to the whole series of facts which could be alleged on the other side. Would not the able and eloquent advocates of their cause have scouted such an appeal to antiquity and scholastic lore, in opposition to the substantial evidence afforded by experience? Would they not have covered the author of such an argument with contempt and derision, and driven him by the powers of their eloquence from the deliberations of a senate to the dust and cobwebs of his forgotten volumes?” —pp. 32, 33.

We regret that our limits do not permit us to present our readers with the continuation of the note, in which Dr. Copleston points out the strong presumption which exists against the credit of all such disavowals on the part of irresponsible individuals, arising from the silence of those authorities whose denial would be conclusive. But we must not trespass any farther upon our limits. Our object in the passages which we have extracted has been rather to excite than to satisfy the desire of our readers, to procure this admirable sermon; and having effected this, as we hope, by the specimens we have selected, it only remains for us to thank Dr. Copleston, as well for the pleasure he has afforded us, as for the service which he has rendered the Church, by his seasonable and able publication.

ART. XV.—1. *Two Letters to the Right Rev. J. Milner, D.D. Bishop of Castabala, Vic. Ap. &c. Occasioned by certain Passages in his "End of Religious Controversy."* By the Rev. T. H. Lowe, M.A. Vicar of Grinley, in the County of Worcester, and Chaplain to the Right Hon. Viscount Gage. London: Rivingtons. 1826.

2. *A Letter to the Right Rev. John Milner, D.D. upon certain erroneous Statements, and incorrect Quotations affecting the Character of Eminent Divines of the Church of England, in a Book entitled "The End of Religious Controversy."* By the Rev. John Garbett, M.A. Minister of St. George's, Birmingham. London: Rivingtons, Hatchards. 1826.

THE death of Bishop Milner, which happened shortly after the appearance of these pamphlets, has disappointed the expectations of a personal reply, which were fully entertained by their authors. But it is still to be hoped that the Roman Catholic Church will furnish us with a defence of her deceased champion. During many a year he was the most learned, the most acute, and, as he himself assured us, the most successful of her polemics. His attempts to explain away her obnoxious tenets have been imitated by Mr. Butler, and outdone by Dr. Doyle. But in the more important task of *terminating* a dispute which has lasted for three hundred years, Bishop Milner stands alone; and his "*End of Controversy*" ought to be protected against the charges with which it was assailed. Unless this is done, Protestants will be justified in saying that it cannot be done; and this popular apology for the tenets of the Church of Rome will rank among the books which that Church disowns.

Whether such repudiation ought, or ought not, to take place, it is for the Romanists, not for us, to determine. But we are disposed to think that the argumentative portion of the "*End of Controversy*" calls for a more succinct answer than it has hitherto received. Substantial answers are already on record. Indeed it would be no difficult task to refute the "*End of Controversy*," upon all its leading points, without introducing a single sentence that has not been in print for a century and a half. The great Protestant writers have answered Bishop Milner again and again; and, at times, we have felt strongly tempted to make a cento from their masterly works, in which the modern Coryphæus of Rome should be put to silence, not by the pigmy efforts of his contemporaries, but by the exact argumentation of Chillingworth and the copious learning of Barrow. This however might be deemed a fantastic operation; and it would, perhaps, be more expedient to

adapt the suitable parts of their immortal works to the new position in which Bishop Milner has arrayed the discomfited arguments of Bellarmine.

But even this cannot be attempted at present. To follow the learned writer through all his turnings and windings, to point out his unauthorised and vague assumptions, his equivocal expressions, his artful substitutions of one term for another, and his illogical inferences and conclusions, would take up more space than we can spare for this article. The master sophism which pervades his volume is a studied confusion between the Rule of Faith and the proper Method of interpreting that rule. These are essentially distinct, and truth can never be discovered by confounding them. Yet the very basis of Bishop Milner's argument takes it for granted, that in the case of Protestants the Rule and the Interpretation of it are one and the same thing, and that in the case of the Roman Catholics, the Rule is both rule and interpretation and the Interpretation both interpretation and rule. (Compare "End of Controversy," p. 42, with "Vindication of the End of Controversy," p. 21 and p. 352.) The object of this sophism is to avoid the awkwardness incidental to the Roman Catholic practice of proving the authority of the Church from the Scriptures, and the authority of the Scriptures from the Church. How completely the manœuvre fails, we need not now observe. The works before us call our attention rather to the controversial honesty than to the skill or success of Dr. Milner; and we extract a few passages from each, which may serve to place the former in a clear light.

Mr. Lowe, in his learned and able pamphlet, points out the following, among many other instances, of Bishop Milner's fair dealing :

"Your proofs, however, from the Fathers, that it [tradition] is even equal to Scripture, miserably fail you. I cannot think it necessary to examine at length your arguments and authorities in defence of this position, for the very first passage you have alleged in its support is so garbled and perverted, that it must utterly ruin your credit with every honest mind. *Tam apertè fumos venditanti etiam jurato non crediderim.* The passage to which I allude occurs in your Tenth Letter, p. 83 : and is as follows : ' I begin with the disciple of the Apostles, St. Ignatius, bishop of Antioch. It is recorded of him that, in his passage to Rome, where he was sentenced to be devoured by wild beasts, he exhorted the Christians, who got access to him, "to guard themselves against the rising heresies, and to adhere with the utmost firmness to the *tradition of the Apostles* :"' WHICH, FOR THE SAKE OF SECURITY, HE THOUGHT IT NECESSARY THEY SHOULD HAVE DRAWN UP IN WRITING.' These last words you wholly omit, and produce the first part of the sentence to prove, that, in the apostolic age, the unwritten word, or tradition, was

held in equal estimation with the Scripture itself. What must we think of a cause that can only be supported by such contemptible artifices?"—pp. 30, 31.

"Whatever arguments may be urged against the worship of the glorified saints and angels, apply, with equal force, to the adoration of their images and relics. I have shown, from the Epistle of the Church of Smyrna, that, in the time of St. Polycarp, the adoration of relics was not practised among Christians. But with respect to the worship of angels and saints, you have alleged a passage from St. Justin Martyr, in which, you say, it is expressly maintained: 'We venerate and worship the angelic host, and the spirits of the prophets, teaching others as we ourselves have been taught.' Such is your translation of St. Justin; and such a specimen of shameless fraud, or incredible ignorance, (you may take your choice,) I firmly believe cannot be paralleled in the whole history of controversy. 'We confess,' says St. Justin, who is defending the Christians from the imputation of Atheism, 'that with respect to such reputed gods we are atheists; but not with respect to the most true God, the Father of righteousness and prudence, and all other virtues, in whom is no admixture of evil. But Him, and his Son, who came from Him, and taught us these things, and the Prophetic Spirit, we worship and adore, in reason and in truth; honouring likewise the host of the other good angels, who minister to Him, and resemble Him.'* I give the passage below, as it stands in the common editions; in the translation, I have not hesitated to adopt the emendation of Dr. Ashton, which is amply justified by the parallel passage, chap. xvi., and is absolutely necessary, unless we would make St. Justin affirm, that the angels, &c. are to be worshipped in the very same manner and degree as the blessed Trinity:—an impiety which, I am sure, Sir, you would not impute to him. Besides, in the language of St. Justin, the words *σέβεσθαι* and *προσκυνεῖν*, always imply that worship which is due to God only. For example; he tells the emperor, that though the Christians thought it unlawful to adore him, they considered it a primary part of their duty to pay all taxes and tribute; for that Christ himself had commanded them, to 'render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's.' In obedience to which precept, he says, 'We worship God only; but render you a cheerful obedience in all other things.'† A passage, by the way, which cuts up your groundless distinction of *Latria*, as the only kind of worship peculiar to God. But to what purpose do I address myself, on such subjects, to a man who translates *Πνεῦμα τὸ προφητικόν*, THE SPIRITS OF THE PROPHETS!"—pp. 45—47.

While Mr. Lowe has thus followed Bishop Milner through his references to the Fathers, and pointed out his very peculiar style

* Justin. Apol. c. vi. καὶ ὁμολογοῦμεν τῶν τοιούτων νομιζομένων θεῶν ἄθεοι εἶναι, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ τοῦ ἀληθεστάτου. καὶ πατρὸς δικαιοσύνης καὶ σωφροσύνης καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀρετῶν, ἀνεπιμικτοῦ τε κακίας θεοῦ ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνον τε, καὶ τὸν παρ' αὐτοῦ υἱὸν ἐλθόντα, καὶ διδάξαντα ἡμᾶς ταῦτα, καὶ τὸν τῶν ἄλλων ἐπομένον καὶ ἱερατευόμενον ἀγαθῶν ἀγγέλων στρατὸν, πνεῦμά τε τὸ προφητικὸν σεβόμεθα καὶ προσκυνούμεν. λόγῳ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ τιμῶντες.

† Justin. Apol. c. 23. "Θεὸν θεὸν μὲν μόνον προσκυνούμεν ὑμῖν δὲ περὶ τὰ ἄλλα χαίροντες ὑπερητούμεν.

of quotation, Mr. Garbett examines the accusations which have been brought against the Bishops of the Church of England, and vindicates them against the charges of hypoërisy which were urged with so little reserve by Dr. Milner, and, in some instances, repeated by Mr. Charles Butler. We cannot follow the author through his detailed and useful inquiries on this subject, but confidently recommend such persons as entertain any doubts respecting the character of Bishop Milner to peruse the whole of these two pamphlets.* The following passages will probably prove more interesting to our readers than such as refer to the conduct of individuals, against whom much has been said, but nothing proved or believed.

"I proceed next to vindicate a very learned and acute defender of Christianity from the charge of falsely translating one of his authorities.

"In the 'Criterion' of Bishop Douglas, a negative argument is drawn against the genuineness of the miracles imputed by your Church to Francis Xavier, from the silence of the Jesuit Missionary, Acosta; in whose book, says his Lordship, 'we find an express acknowledgment, that no miracles had ever been performed by Missionaries amongst the Indians.' Thus far you quote the Bishop; but the pith of his argument consists in the words immediately following. 'For,' he adds, 'Acosta assigns it as one reason why the Gospel was not propagated by them with the same success as it was by the Apostles, that the power of working miracles did not subsist among the Missionaries; who not being able to excite the admiration or the fear of the barbarians, by the majesty of any such works, were, consequently, despised by reason of their mean appearance.' This is the passage, upon quoting the former part of which, you exclaim—'What will the admirers of this Detector say, if it should appear that Acosta barely says, "that there was not the same *faculty* or *facility* of working miracles among the Missionaries, which there was among the Apostles?"' (p. 187.) The best reply to this demand will be to produce the words of Acosta, as I find them in the 'Criterion,' not having the book itself at hand to consult. You give us only the first part of the passage, omitting that which would clear away all ambiguity, if any such there were, in your extract, '*Altera causa in nobis est, cur apostolica prædicatio institui omnino non possit apostolice, quod miraculorum nulla facultas sit;—nostri nunc temporis cum talium operum majestate sese barbaris admirandos et timendos non præbeant, nihil restat nisi ut reliqua vitæ inopia et impotentia penitus contemnatur.*' No

* The absurd accusation against the late Bishop Halifax, which originated with Bishop Milner, has been revived, we observe, in a provincial newspaper by a Clergyman of the Church of Rome; and coupled with a similar charge against the late Sir John Cox Hipplesley. The latter accusation is as contemptible as the former. If a shadow of doubt exist in the mind of any individual respecting the truth of the charges against Bishop Halifax, let him consult a pamphlet written by the Bishop, within a few weeks of his death, entitled, *An Apology for the Liturgy and Clergy of the Church of England, by a Clergyman.* Rivingtons. 1790. In this pamphlet Bishop Halifax speaks of *Popery* in language which cannot be mistaken.

one can, for an instant, doubt of the strict accuracy of the Bishop's version. Acosta most explicitly declares, first, that the preaching of the gospel could not be carried on by them with the success of the Apostles, because they had 'not any power of doing miracles, *miraculorum nulla facultas*.' Secondly, that they could not render themselves objects of terror or admiration to the barbarians, by the 'majesty of such works,' and were therefore utterly despised; which he could scarcely have said, if they had any miraculous powers: much less, if he believed, as you tell us, that Xavier himself performed miracles 'too numerous to be related.'—pp. 51—53.

"In p. 129, you tell the world, to gratify, I presume, the popular love of novelty, that the omission of this Creed, 'so often took place in public Service, that an Act of Parliament has just been passed to enforce the repetition of it.' Upon this extraordinary statement, I would only observe, that if you really are aware of the existence of such an Act—of which no one in the kingdom, except yourself, has ever heard,—you might possibly render a kindness to some persons who may unwarily transgress any of its enactments, by informing them where this secret piece of legislation is to be found."—p. 54.

The last piece of intelligence may perhaps claim to be excused as a blunder. Had Dr. Milner been a person of less pretension to accuracy, such an excuse might be admitted. As it is, we can only explain the absurdity of advancing such a ridiculous charge by comparing it with another passage in the same volume, (End of Controversy, p. 57,) in which the Doctor, undertaking to prove that the Scriptures were not designed for a Rule of Faith, declares that "St. Luke addressed his Gospel to an individual, Theophilus, having *written it*, says the holy Evangelist, because it seemed good to him so to do." Is this to be denominated carelessness, or fatuity, or fraud? We leave it to the surviving friends of Bishop Milner to answer the question.

ART. XVI.—*A Sermon preached before the Incorporated Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts; at their Anniversary Meeting in the Parish Church of St. Mary-le-Bow, on Friday, February 15, 1827.* By the Right Reverend Charles James, Lord Bishop of Chester. London. Rivingtons. 1827. 8vo. 1s. 6d. pp. 24.

THE Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts very judiciously requested the Bishop of Chester "to permit the immediate publication of this Sermon, as containing observations which have a direct reference to the state of the Church of India, during the vacancy of the See of Calcutta." And to these observations, consequently, must our chief attention be directed. But it would be unjust to the preacher, as well as the Society whose

cause he advocates, to omit all notice of that portion of his Lordship's discourse which refers to the general diffusion of Christianity, and to the past and present prospects of the Church in North America.

Having contrasted the rapid propagation of the Gospel during the first age of the Church, with the tardy advances which have been since made, the Bishop adverts to the unhappy success of those enemies of the Church who have wrested from it no inconsiderable part of its territories, and adds an impressive warning, together with an able vindication of the ancient proceedings of the Society.

His Lordship then remarks, that the duty incumbent upon a Christian government of providing for the religious instruction of its subjects cannot be denied, however the acknowledgment of it may be evaded, and trusting that this will be remembered by the promoters of emigration, he proceeds to the second great division of the discourse, and shows that the conversion of unbelievers, a work from which the state may *possibly* claim an exemption, is the legitimate object of a voluntary association.

This is a just and important distinction. The neglect with which Christianity has been treated in our North American colonies, is utterly indefensible. As such it is now regarded by the country, and we trust by his majesty's ministers also. When any fresh instance of its existence comes under notice, we are not called upon to prove that it ought to cease, but it suffices to point out the nuisance, and require that it be abated without delay; the scandal is gross and offensive, and no apology short of its removal can be accepted. But men are not yet agreed in opinion, how far the ruling powers are bound to promote the evangelization of the heathen, within the limits of their territory; and the manly and Christian arguments by which the Bishop of Chester contends that no government can be exonerated from such a duty, are destined, we trust, to turn the scale which has hung long in doubt. The passages in which his Lordship applies his general reasoning to the present state of the Church in India, will make our readers acquainted with the outline of his argument.

"I would direct this inquiry, with peculiar earnestness of application, to our relations with that vast empire which has sprung up in the East, like the seed which is cast into the ground, and springeth and groweth up, men know not how. Has either part of the obligation, incumbent on a Christian country, been adequately fulfilled; the providing for the spiritual nurture and steadfastness of those who are already believers, or the bringing of the heathen into the fold of Christ?

"It is only of late that the rulers of that prodigious empire have opened their eyes to the necessity of planting in those regions, where

Christianity can afford to dispense with none of her means or aids, a religious establishment, formed after that model, which the apostles themselves stationed in the midst of an unbelieving world. From that moment it may be said of our Indian possessions, that the Lord hath *planted a vineyard there, and built a tower, and let it out to husbandmen, and at the season* He will send his servants to receive the fruit; and we are persuaded, not in vain,"—p. 16.

"It was the peculiar felicity of that Church, rather, I should say, it was of God's providential appointment, that its first rulers and nursing fathers were two men, singularly gifted and qualified for the work which it fell to their lot to perform. To the enlarged wisdom, the sagacious discernment, the sound discretion, the steady perseverance *through evil report and good report*, the uncompromising firmness, the calm and steady piety of him, who laid its foundations, and planned its outworks, and delineated, with the eye and the hand of a master, the provinces of its officers, a just and well remembered tribute has been rendered from this place. How little did we think, while listening with mournful interest to that eloquent expression of deep regret and cheering anticipation, that within four short years the melancholy theme was to be resumed, and the second Indian bishop spoken of, as one called to his account. Yet it is doubtless within the recollection of some who now hear me, that when that lamented servant of God addressed his parting words of promise and encouragement to the venerable Society, which had long watched over and fostered the Protestant Missions in India, a sentiment of foreboding mingled itself in the minds of many with that of rejoicing and hope, *lest they should see his face no more*.

"They beheld in him an ardent zeal for God's glory and the salvation of men; a spirit of unqualified self-devotion; an unreserved dedication of himself to the holy cause which he had taken in hand; a willing and deliberate sacrifice of personal ease and comfort, both in possession and in prospect; a singleness and fixedness of determination to *spend and be spent* for the gospel; the concentration, upon that single object, of all the powers and resources of a mind unusually gifted by nature, and perfected by education; an apostolical simplicity of heart and manner, and an almost apostolical eloquence: all this they saw, and rejoiced in the abundance of those graces, which bespoke *the man of God thoroughly furnished unto all good works*.

"But when they considered that *this treasure was in earthen vessels*, and that the full and satisfactory discharge of the duties which he had undertaken, was beyond and above the scope of individual strength and opportunity, yet not above the enterprise of a spirit like his; and when they remembered how fatal a proof had just been given of the utter disproportion between the labours of the Indian episcopate and the provision made for their discharge,—they felt an irresistible presage of evil. And how have both their hopes and their apprehensions been realized!

"How has the Christian Church in India rejoiced, and put forth its infant strength under his fostering care! How have the great designs of its founder been developed and executed, as far as time and means permitted, by his successor! How were the beauty and simplicity of the Gospel enforced by his eloquence, and exemplified in his life! How

have the sanctity and the usefulness of his sacred office been demonstrated by many proofs and marks of an apostolical ministry; *in much patience, in afflictions, in necessities—in labours, in watchings, in fastings—by pureness, by knowledge, by long-suffering—by love unfeigned; by the word of truth—by the armour of righteousness on the right hand and on the left!*

“How lively an interest did he excite, amongst those who were before indifferent, in the success of that great object which was his own heart's desire, the conversion of the heathen! How did he bend the eyes and hearts of men towards himself as the Chief Missionary of the East; a high and venerable designation, which he deserved, and in which he delighted!

“But as he counted not his life dear unto himself, so that he might finish his course with joy, and the ministry which he had received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the Gospel of the Grace of God; so under the labours of that ministry did he sink, and in the discharge of its most solemn and affecting duties was suddenly called to his Lord. *Blessed is that servant, whom his Lord when he cometh shall find so doing.*

“And others, no doubt, may be found, to run the same career of usefulness and hazard. But is it not the duty of those in whose hands Providence has placed the means, at once to increase the usefulness and to diminish the hazard of the episcopal office in India, by sending forth more labourers into a harvest, the gathering in of which exhausted the vital energies of a Middleton and a Heber? Shall the advocate of Christian missions suffer this opportunity to pass, without expressing an earnest hope that the spiritual claims of millions of benighted subjects, the sacred interests of the Gospel cause, the loud and deep expression of opinion from a Christian people, may at length and for ever preponderate against the sordid calculations of a secular policy, and the deadening influence of that worldly wisdom which *careth for none of these things*, but regards all modes of religion with equal indifference; and that, as far as human means can be effectual, *the word of the Lord may have free course and be glorified* in that country to which so vast a debt is due?”—pp. 18—21.

When we read this eloquent and affecting passage, and remember the character of the prelate by whom it was spoken, we cannot bring ourselves to believe that it has been spoken in vain. In the temperate and religious advice, in the simple energetic language of the Bishop of Chester, we recognize the voice of the Church of England, speaking in the person of one of her most respected sons,—and we are confident she will be listened to with respect. It is understood that the East India Company are willing to comply with the reasonable request of the Church: it is impossible to believe that his Majesty's Government are unwilling. They acknowledge that a division of the Diocese of Calcutta is desirable; and they have furnished the strongest argument for it themselves—MINISTERS HAVE BEEN ACQUAINTED WITH BISHOP HEBER'S DECEASE FOR MORE THAN HALF A YEAR, AND ARE NOT PREPARED TO SUPPLY HIS PLACE.

LAW PROCEEDINGS

RELATIVE TO THE CHURCH.

LORD SONDES *v.* FLETCHER.

A QUESTION of the highest importance, as it regards the government of the church on the one hand, and the rights of patrons on the other, has lately occupied the attention of the House of Lords, upon an appeal from a judgment of the Court of King's Bench, affirmed by the Court of Exchequer Chamber. The action was brought upon a bond, with a penalty of £12,000, which was given by Mr. *Fletcher*, who had been presented to the Living of Kettering, in Northamptonshire, by Lord *Sondes*. The condition of the bond was to vacate the living, upon the request of the patron, as soon as one of the brothers of Lord *Sondes* should be qualified to be presented as rector. Among other things, the condition recited that the living had become vacant, and that Lord *Sondes* had presented it to Mr. *Fletcher* by an instrument bearing the same date as the bond. The breach assigned of the condition was, that Mr. *Fletcher*, upon a request to resign (one of the younger brothers of Lord *Sondes* being capable of holding) had refused to vacate the living. The defendant having suffered judgment by default, a writ of inquiry was executed, and the damages assessed at £12,000, the amount of the penalty; upon which the judgment was entered. Upon the appeal to the House of Lords, after the case had been elaborately argued by counsel, the question was put to the judges,—“whether sufficient matter appears upon the record to show that, either by the statute or the common law, the bond upon which the action was brought and stated “to bear equal date with the presentation, is void or illegal?” Upon this question the judges, not being agreed, gave their opinions *seriatim*.

Mr. *Justice Gaselee* (after stating the facts) proceeded as follows: The ground of objection which has been taken to this bond is that it is simoniacal, and not only contrary to the statute of 31 *Eliz.* c. 6., but, also, to the common law and public policy. But another question has been raised at the bar,—whether, admitting this objection to be good, it can be taken advantage of in the present state of the record, or whether there should not have been a plea averring that the bond was given in consideration of the presentation? It will not be necessary to consume much time in the consideration of this question, because it appears to me to be impossible to read the condition of the bond without coming to the conclusion, that the bond was given in consideration of the presentation, and if so, it is unnecessary to introduce any specific averment of that fact.

I shall therefore confine my observations to the principal question, whether special resignation bonds, for the purpose of presenting particular persons when capable of taking the benefice, are legal, and whether the persons mentioned in this condition are such in whose behalf such a stipulation may be made? Of course I confine myself to special resignation bonds, because, since the case of *Efytche* and the Bishop of *London*, which was decided in this House in the year 1783, I am precluded from contending that a general resignation bond can, under any circumstances, be supported. Before the determination of that case by this House, there had been many cases in which it had been decided by the courts below that general resignation bonds were upon the face of them good, and were not to be avoided except by plea showing them to have been originally made upon some corrupt contract not appearing upon the bond itself, or that an ill use was endeavoured to be made of them, by attempting to put them in force for improper purposes; in which latter case the remedy was an application to a court of equity for an injunction to restrain their being put in suit. It is true that in some of the cases before *Efytche* and the Bishop of *London*, doubts had been thrown out as to the validity of general bonds of resignation, but in most, if not all the cases, special bonds for legitimate purposes, among which the presenting the patron himself, his son, or, (as one of the cases has it,) his friend, were held to be good. And it is surely quite evident that there is a manifest distinction between general and special bonds of resignation, in as much as, if the patron wishes to sell the advowson, it is much more valuable by means of a general bond of resignation, the purchaser can at any time compel a vacancy. This cannot be in the case of a special bond like the present, but on the contrary, as in general the party intended to be presented is under age when the bond is given, the consequence of his being presented would be the putting in a younger life, which would generally render the advowson less valuable as an object of sale.

The first case with which I shall trouble your lordships is *Johnes v. Lawrence*,* which is thus reported by Croke, J. twenty-one years only after passing the 31st of Elizabeth:—"Debt upon an obligation of 1000 marks conditioned: whereas the obligee had procured from Queen Elizabeth letters of presentation to the church of Stretham, and was to present *Lawrence*, intending when his son *John* should be capable to procure another presentation of him to the said church, if the said obligor, within three months after his request, upon his presentation, admission, institution, and induction to the said church, should resign his benefice absolutely; that then the obligation shall be void. The defendant pleads that he was not requested; and issue joined thereupon and found for the plaintiff, and moved in arrest of judgment: First, that it appears by the condition of the bond to be a simoniacal contract, and against law, and therefore the obligation void, *sed non allocatur*, for there doth not any simony appear upon the condition. And such a condition is good enough, and lawful, wherefore it was adjudged for the plaintiff. Afterwards a writ of error was brought upon this judgment in the Exchequer Chamber, and the principal error insisted upon was, that this condition is against law, for it appears upon the condition entered, that it was for simony, which makes the obligation void; but all the judges of the Com-

* Cro. Jac. 248. See also p. 274.

mon Bench and Barons of the Exchequer held, that the obligation and condition are good enough; for a man may bind himself to resign, and it is not unlawful, but may be upon good and valuable reasons, without any colour of simony: As to be obliged to resign if he take another benefice, or if he be non-resident for the space of so many months, or, as this case is, to resign upon request, if the patron will present his son thereto when he should be of age capable to take it. But if it had been averred that it was per colorem simonii; viz.—If he did not suffer the patron to enjoy a lease of the glebe or tithes, or if he did not pay such a sum of money, that had been simony, and it is possible might have made the obligation void. But as this case is, there doth not appear any cause to adjudge it to be void for simony; wherefore the judgment was affirmed.”

The doctrine in the case of *Johnes v. Lawrence*, was adopted and acted upon in the subsequent case of *Babington v. Wood*:* “Debt upon an obligation conditioned: whereas the plaintiff intended to present the defendant to such a benefice, that if the defendant, at any time after his admission, institution and induction, at the plaintiff’s request, resigned the said benefice into the hands of the Bishop of London, that then, &c. The defendant, upon oyer of the condition, demurred generally. And this was argued by *Grimston* for the plaintiff, and by *Calthrop* for the defendant, who showed that the cause of demurrer was, for that the condition of the bond being to resign upon request of the patron, it is simony and against law; so the bond void. But all the Court conceived that if the defendant had averred, that the obligation was made to bind him to pay such a sum, or to make a lease or other act which appears in itself to be simony, then upon such a plea, peradventure it might have appeared to the Court to be simony, and might have been a question whether such a bond for simony should be void: but as it is pleaded by way of demurrer upon the oyer of the condition, it doth not appear that there is any simony; for such a bond to cause him to resign may be good, and upon good reason and discretion required by the patron, viz.—If he be non-resident, or takes a second benefice by a qualification, or the like; and a precedent was shown in octavo Jacobi, betwixt *Johnes* and *Lawrence*, where such a bond was made to resign a benefice upon request, when the son of *Johnes* came to be twenty-four years of age, to the intent that he might be presented unto it: and it was adjudged good in the King’s Bench, and affirmed on a writ of error in the Exchequer Chamber, and of this opinion was all the Court; whereupon judgment was given for the plaintiff. *Hatton*, who reports the same case, says, that upon error brought in the Exchequer Chamber the judgment was affirmed, (Jones, 220. S. C.) accordingly, and that it was affirmed in error upon viewing the precedent of *Johnes v. Lawrence*.”

In that case it does not appear that the condition of the bond was to resign in favour of any particular person, but generally; but it is obvious that the case turns mainly upon *Johnes v. Lawrence*, which it treats therefore as an express authority.

In an anonymous case, reported in 3 Modern, 54, in which a general bond of resignation was held good, although Mr. Justice *Powel* states his opinion, “that when first the judges held these bonds good, if they had

* Cro. Car. 180. Hatt. 220. S. C.

foreseen the mischief of them, they would have been of another opinion." Yet he considers that the patron having a son of his own, who may be capable of a benefice, it is an honest intent: and Justice *Blinco* says, "Here is a particular circumstance why it should not be thought simony; because it is a sum much above the value of the benefice: if indeed it had been for a sum of less value, it might be intended perhaps that the parson would rather pay it than resign:" and be it remembered, Justice *Twisden* said, "he had known such a bond held good twelve times; so it would be hard to oppose it now, there appearing no simony in the condition, and the defendant not averring any."

What proportion the penalty in this bond of £12,000 bears to the value of the living does not appear; but it must be taken for granted the bond was *bonâ fide* given for the purpose mentioned in the condition. If it were really colorable, and the real intention was that there should be no resignation, but that the patron should receive the penalty, it should have been pleaded, and that might have altered the case.

The case of *Hilliard v. Stapylton** is thus reported: "The guardian of an infant presented to a living, and took a bond from the incumbent to resign within two months after request of the patron or his heirs, it being designed that he should have the living himself when capable. The patron afterwards died an infant at the University, leaving two sisters his heirs, who pressed the incumbent to resign, and for not doing it, put the bond in suit, and recovered judgment; and this bill was brought to be relieved against the bond and judgment. And it was proved in the cause that they had treated with the incumbent to sell him the perpetual advowson, and had said that if he would not give £700 for it, they would make him resign. The Lord *Keeper* said, the proof in this case lies on the defendants' part, and unless they make out some good reason for removing him, he should certainly decree against the bond. Bonds for resignation have been held good in law. The statute of 31 *Eliz.* against simony, made the penalty upon the lay patron; and he did not remember any case of resignation bonds before that statute, and they have been allowed since only to preserve the living for the patron himself, or for a child, or to restrain the incumbent from non-residence or a vicious course of life; and if any other advantage be made thereof, it will avoid the bond: and where it is general for resignation, yet some special reason must be shown to require a resignation, or he would not suffer it to be put in suit. If it should not be so, simony will be committed without proof or punishment. A particular agreement must be proved to resign for the benefit of a friend who would be presented, and without such agreement the bond ought not to be sued, but for misbehaviour of the parson, and here are proofs in this case of endeavours to get money out of the plaintiff: and he decreed a perpetual injunction against the bond, and satisfaction to be acknowledged upon the judgment, and the plaintiff to give a new bond, of £200 penalty, to resign, but that not to be sued without leave of the Court."

It is difficult to say why there should be a new bond, the party intended to be presented being dead. And in *Ambler*, 268, the Lord

* 2 Equity Cases abridged.

Chancellor is stated to have said, that the Lord *Keeper* went too far; but I cite the case to show that there was then no idea that a bond to resign, for a son or even a friend of the patron to be presented, was illegal; the only ground of applying to the Court of Chancery being the "ill use that had been made of it."

So in *Peele v. Capel*.^{*} Capel, on presenting Peele to a living, took a bond from him to resign when the patron's nephew came of age, for whom the living was designed. When the nephew was of age, instead of requiring a resignation, it was agreed between them all that Peele should continue to hold the living, paying £30 per annum to the nephew. Peele makes the payment for seven years, but refusing to pay any more, the patron put the bond in suit, and then Peele comes into the Court for an injunction, and to have back his £30 per annum. On the hearing the Chancellor granted the injunction, not (as he said) upon account of any defect in the bond itself, which he held good, but on account of the ill use that had been made upon it. And as to the money, it being paid upon a simoniacal contract, he left the plaintiff to go to law for it.

These are all the cases respecting special resignation bonds which I have met with before the decision of *Efytche v. The Bishop of London*. I proceed now to those which have arisen during the succeeding period of forty-three years. The first is *Bagshaw v. Batley*,[†] which was an action on a bond given by the defendant on his appointment to the curacy of the free chapel of *Wormhill*, in the county of *Derby*, which, after reciting that the defendant had agreed to be constantly and duly resident at the curacy house there: and in default of such residence, to resign and deliver up the curacy within one month after request or notice in writing left at the curacy house, so that the patron might present anew, was conditioned for such resignation in default of such constant and due residence, so that the patron, the obligee, might present anew, discharged of all charges and incumbrances done and suffered by the obligor, and for the not committing wastes or dilapidations upon the houses or lands belonging to the curacy. To this the defendant pleaded several pleas: 1st. That he had resided at the curacy, and had not committed or suffered wastes or dilapidations. 2dly. That after his appointment to the curacy, he had a general license from the obligee to reside elsewhere. Replication: 1st. That the defendant voluntarily absented himself from the 7th day of April, 1790, to the 8th of April in the year following, and that the plaintiff had given him notice to resign, which he had refused to do. 2dly. That after the time when the supposed license was granted, viz. on 7th April, 1790, the plaintiff countermanded and revoked the license, and that the defendant absented himself, &c. as in the former replication. To both these replications there was a general demurrer. *Sutton*, in support of the demurrer, contended, first, that the bond was illegal and void; and secondly, that the license was general, and could not be revoked. First, the bond is illegal, because it placed the incumbent under the undue control of the patron, after the presentation, and after the relation between them had ceased, and a new relation had sprung up between the incumbent and the ordinary, to whom only he owed obedience. The right of presentation in

* 1 Strange, 534.

† 4 Term Reports, 78.

the patron is a public trust, and not a mere private interest. The duties of the incumbent are prescribed by the municipal law, and the canons and ordinances of the church, and therefore it was not competent to the patron to impose any private condition of his own creating beyond those which the civil and ecclesiastical law have deemed it necessary to require. With respect to the residence required by the bond, that is carried much farther than the law requires it, for the statute of *Henry VIII.* only imposes certain penalties, much inferior to that imposed by this bond for non-residence: and besides, there may be various defences to an action on that statute, as amongst others residence upon another living by dispensation, whereas there can be no excuse under this unless the license of the patron be such. And further, in this case the living itself is to become vacant: again too in this case the penalty is to become due to the patron, in case of dilapidations, in which he has no sort of interest, that being but the sole concern of his successor. The effect, therefore, of this bond, is to raise to the patron a special interest in the exercise of a public trust, which by law he was not invested with.—*Chambre*, contra. was stopped by the Court.—Lord *Kenyon* said, I cannot bring myself to entertain a doubt upon this case. It has been argued that the patron's right of presentation is a mere trust; it is so to some purposes, but not to all. It is a trust coupled with an interest, for it is a subject of a conveyance for a valuable consideration, which is not the case with a naked trust. As soon as the defendant was presented to the living, he was bound to take upon himself all the duties of an incumbent; to reside upon the living, to take upon himself the cure of souls, and to keep the house in proper repair: now this bond was only entered into for the purpose of securing a performance of all these duties, which by law, and without the bond, he was bound to discharge. I avoid saying any thing respecting the case of the Bishop of *London v. Ffytche*: when that question comes again before the House of Lords, they will, I have no doubt, review the former decision, if it should become necessary. It is sufficient for me, in deciding the present case, to say, that it cannot be governed by that, for here the plaintiff does not call for the resignation of the incumbent, but merely for a performance of those duties which in morality, religion, and law, he ought to do. I am therefore clearly of opinion, that a bond for the performance of these duties is not illegal.—Justice *Buller* said, I cannot find any immorality or illegality in this bond. It is the duty of the incumbent to reside on his living, and to be regular in the discharge of his duties. Now this requires nothing more: it only requires him to do what the law would have compelled him to do without it. Justice *Grose* was of the same opinion. *Ashurst* was absent.

Although in this case the bond was not for resignation to the patron, or to any relation, on his becoming capable and desirous of taking it, yet it amounts to a decision of the Court, that the giving of a special bond of resignation is not in all cases illegal.

The next case was precisely in point with the present. It is *Partridge v. Whiston*.* The condition of the bond, after stating the presentation of the defendant to the rectory of *Cranwick* and the vicarage of *Methwold*, in *Norfolk*, recites an agreement to be personally resident in one or other

of these parishes, or in *Northwold*, which is contiguous to both, without absence for eighty days in any one year: to serve the cure of these two parishes himself, if his health would permit; and not to serve the cure of any other parish while he held those: that as the two livings together were a comfortable provision for one clergyman, though neither of them separately was such, the defendant had agreed never to resign one without the other: that the plaintiff had a son about fourteen years of age, who probably would take orders, and might be desirous of taking these livings; and therefore the defendant had agreed in that event to resign both the livings upon three months' notice to be given by the plaintiff, in order that the plaintiff's son might be presented thereto: the bond was conditioned to perform this agreement, and to keep in good repair the rectory house and chancel of *Cranwick*, and the vicarage house of *Methwold*. The Court, understanding that it was intended to carry this case up to the House of Lords, gave judgment for the plaintiff, without hearing any argument. They said, as this case was not precisely similar to that of the Bishop of *London v. Ffytche*, they were bound by the established series of precedents to give judgment for the plaintiff. I do not find that the case was ever carried further.

The next case is not one for a resignation bond with respect to an ecclesiastical benefice, but I cite it for the purpose of showing the opinion of Lord *Kenyon* on the point now in question. It is the case of *Legh v. Lewis*,* where the patron of a school had taken a general resignation bond on the appointment of the master. Lord *Kenyon* said, in the instance of ecclesiastical livings, every rector has a freehold in his rectory; yet it was never doubted but that resignation bonds for certain purposes, and up to a certain extent, at least, were binding, though they put an end to the freehold.—Justice *Lawrence* doubted whether the appointment could be made otherwise than for life; but he says it is true that a bond may be taken to enforce the observance of those duties which by law are required to be performed by the appointee of an office, but then it should be so expressed in the condition.

In 3 *Bosanquet and Puller*, 231, this case is reported in the Exchequer Chamber, and judgment affirmed without argument, it not sufficiently appearing on the record that the office of school-master was such as ought to be deemed a freehold office.

In *Newman v. Newman*,† upon a bond to pay certain sums of money on the conveyance of an estate, having an advowson appurtenant, to the obligor; and in case a living should become vacant during the life of the son of the obligee, and he should be qualified, to present him; and if he should be under age, and it should be necessary to present another, to procure such other to resign when the son should be of age; it became unnecessary to decide whether the latter part of the condition was good.—Justice *Le Blanc* says, the reason for making an exception in favour of a condition for presenting a son might be because it was not for a money consideration.—Justice *Dampier* says, if a bond to resign in favour of a particular person were necessarily void, the objection would have been good in *Johnes v. Lawrence*; but a stipulation to resign in favour

* 1 East, 391.

† 4 Maule and Selwyn, 66.

of a specified person, does not seem to be open to the same objection as if it were to resign generally, because the latter makes the incumbent but a mere tenant at will to the patron. I know that since the case of the *Bishop of London v. Ffytche*, it has been considered that bonds to resign in favour of specified persons are not illegal.

In *Lord Kirkcubright v. Lady Kirkcubright*,* a bond was given to pay £100 a year until the obligee should be instituted and placed in possession of a living in the Church of England, then to pay him so much as with the value of the living shall amount to £150. There was also an agreement by Lord Kirkcubright to enter into orders and take the living, and if he did not the bond was to be of no avail. The obligor having died intestate, the obligee filed a bill praying an account, and that the arrears of his annuity might be paid him. "The Lord Chancellor expressed great doubt as to the validity of the bond: observing, that it was void on many accounts; it is," he says, "a corrupt agreement for taking holy orders such as the Court ought to decree to be delivered up. The policy of the Ecclesiastical constitution of the country requires, that a man should take orders without any reference whatever to considerations of that nature. There is no objection to the bond itself except as connected with this agreement at the same time for a pecuniary consideration to take holy orders. Another objection to the bond is, that the father is put under these circumstances, that he is to solicit the benefit of patronage for this pecuniary consideration moving from himself; the policy of the law supposing the patron to look for persons the best that can be recommended to him, which excludes pecuniary considerations. The cause stood over in order that this point might be considered. It was ultimately decided that the obligee had not performed the conditions, inasmuch as he had only taken deacons' orders, and had not answered whether he meant to enter into priests' orders. That case contains no decision upon the validity of special resignation bonds, though the Lord Chancellor, speaking of resignation bonds in general, states himself to have no doubt that they were generally against the policy of the law, and says, that the question of their legality would never have perplexed him if there had not been so many authorities.

Another case has been referred to in the argument,† where a bond of resignation had been given in favour of a particular individual and not to accept a bishopric. The application was for an injunction, principally on the ground that the bond as to the resignation which had been given in consequence of supposed directions in a will, had been so given by mistake, it having been afterwards discovered that it was intended by the testator that the party should be presented without any such obligation. The Lord Chancellor said, it was very difficult, upon the pleadings in the *Bishop of London v. Ffytche*, to reconcile the distinction between general and particular bonds of resignation with the principle on which the House of Lords made that decision; but, he adds, "it would not however become me, having regard to what is the present state of the law on this subject, to interpose in a court of equity on the ground that this is a particular bond of resignation, although I agree that this court, if it

* 8 Ves. 51.

† *Dashwood v. Peyton*, in 18 Ves. 27.

has a concurrent jurisdiction, is not bound to wait for the decision of a court of law, yet reasonable caution requires a court of equity not hastily to pronounce bad a bond understood to be good at law, and it would at least be proper to leave that question to be reconsidered at law. The injunction was refused.

The last case to be found on the subject is *ex parte Rainier, Rowlatt v. Rowlatt**. The father, on the marriage of his son, gave a bond to trustees, *inter alia*, for performance of a covenant in the settlement, whereby he covenanted, that until the son should become the actual incumbent of the rectory of *North Benfleet*, or should be in the enjoyment of some other benefice or ecclesiastical preferment which he might hold during his life, of the yearly value of £600 at the least, or until his death, he would pay him an annuity of £200. The father became a bankrupt; the petition was presented by the son and his trustees to prove in respect of the bond. It appeared that the son had been presented to a living of £600 a year, but had given a bond to resign in favour of two sons of the patron, when either of them should be qualified and willing to be presented to it, and instituted and inducted. The eldest son took orders, and the living was in consequence resigned within two years after the presentation. It was contended, that the son having been presented the condition was satisfied; on the other hand, it was said, that having been presented on a condition to resign and a bond given to that effect, it was a benefice that could not have been retained for life. The Lord Chancellor said, still he might have held it for life, he might if he chose have kept the living and forfeited the bond; you may, however, if you like, take a case into the court of King's Bench. The reporter says, the matter stood over for the plaintiff to consider whether they would take a case, which they afterwards accepted, but it is understood that they have since declined to persevere in it.

I apprehend that case could only have been directed upon the ground that the court of King's Bench might have held the bond legal; for if it was simoniacal, the party could not have held the living, even if he had paid the penalty. For the presentation would have been absolutely void, and consequently not a satisfaction of the condition.

I have now gone through all the cases I can find respecting special resignation bonds, extending over a period of above 200 years; in none of which has such a bond been held bad; in many it has been expressly determined to be good, and admitted to be so in most of those in which validity of general bonds of resignation has been disputed or denied. In one or two of the latest cases, indeed, in the court of Chancery, it has been stated to be very difficult upon the pleading in the case of the *Bishop of London v. Ffytche*, to reconcile the distinction between general and particular bonds of resignation with the principle on which the House of Lords made that decision. The main principle upon which the decision proceeded, appears to me to have been the enabling the patron to have made a greater profit on the sale of the advowson, and the converting the tenure of the incumbent into a tenancy at will. This I have already stated not to be applicable to the case of a bond to resign in

* 1 Jacob and Walker, 230.

favour of a particular person. The only objection applicable to a special in common with the general resignation bond appears to be the reducing the tenure from an absolute freehold for life to one for a less period, but however that might be available if the objection had been made for the first time, the practice as to special bonds appears to have been too long acted upon and acquiesced in now to call it in question.

Under these circumstances, therefore, can a court of law now adjudge that they are bad; particularly when it is considered that the consequence of holding them to be so must be to submit to severe penalties those who have been acting upon a practice of upwards of two centuries, and which has never yet been declared illegal, and in many instances expressly determined to be legal? Those penalties, if the bond be considered as illegal, under the statute of Elizabeth, extending to the forfeiture of the presentation and two years' value of the benefice.

The provisions of the statute apply "to any person, &c. who shall present or collate for any sum of money, reward, gift, profit, or benefit, whatsoever, directly or indirectly, or for or by reason of any promise or agreement, grant, bond, covenant or other assurance of or for any sum of money, reward, gift, profit, or benefit, whatsoever." It is not contended that this case comes within any of the words of the statute except the word *BENEFIT*, and it is said that a resignation bond in favour of a son is a benefit to the father, inasmuch as it relieves him from making any other provision for him, which he would otherwise be bound to do. To this I answer, that this is not the species of benefit which the statute contemplated. A general resignation bond may be so, as I before stated, as it enhances the value of the living if sold during the incumbency, and amounts to a sale with the means of procuring an immediate vacancy. But if this be so considered, it would be equally a benefit when the father presents the son on a fair vacancy, or even where he presents himself; in either case it may be said he makes the presentation a means of providing for an expenditure he must necessarily incur; and therefore, circuitously, at least, a source of profit to himself. The statute has never yet been intended to operate to that extent; and the observation made at the bar, that upon looking at the 8th section the word benefit must be taken to mean a pecuniary benefit, and that the two clauses ought have a similar construction, appears to me to be entitled to considerable weight.

It might perhaps be urged, that in this case it does not appear that the patron was bound to provide for his younger brother, and therefore it can be in no sense a benefit to the patron, which it is but fair to consider the meaning intended by the statute to be applied to the word *benefit*, coupled as it is with the words sum of money, reward, gift, or profit. But it seems to me to be sufficient to say the act has never been held to extend to bonds of this description; that, on the contrary, they have been uniformly held good in Westminster hall, and that it would be contrary to the principle universally acted upon with respect to penal law, viz. that they are to be strictly construed, now to extend it to them.

But it is asked, admitting a resignation bond in favor of a son to be good, to what degree of relationship and to what number of persons is it to extend? To this I answer, that it must, like many other cases, depend

upon what shall be considered reasonable. With respect to the present case, such a bond, in favor of a more remote degree of relationship than a brother, has been held good; for in the case of *Peele v. Capel*, before cited, the bond was in favor of a nephew; and in *Rowlatt v. Rowlatt*, where the bond was in favor of two sons, when either of them should be qualified, no objection was taken on that ground; but, on the contrary, a presentation, accompanied by such a bond, was considered as a satisfaction of the condition to pay an annuity until the party should be in the enjoyment of a benefice which he might hold for his life. It is also to be observed that the statute of *Eliz.* is not confined to bonds and securities, but extends to any promise, agreement, grant, bond, covenant, or any other assurance. If therefore the bond in this case is illegal, and avoids the presentation, the same rule applies to every verbal promise or honorary engagement, expressed or perhaps only implied, surely then it is necessary to pause before a decision is adopted, which may, in its consequences, involve, in the guilt of simony and the penalties of the statutes, parties, than whom none would be more abhorrent from such an offence, into whose contemplation it could never for a moment have entered that they were acting illegally, in making or accepting resignations, under circumstances sanctioned by the practice of centuries and the current of legal decisions, and who, from their peculiar station in society, would have been the last to have put themselves in the smallest hazard of having it imputed to them for an instant, that they had concurred in or lent their sanction to any act, of the legality or propriety of which a doubt could be entertained.

Another objection taken to these bonds, is the oath taken upon institution, but this seems to me to be begging the question: The oath is—"I do swear that I have made no *simoniacal* payment, contract, or promise." Now, before the giving of such a bond can be considered a breach of the oath, it must be determined that such a bond is a *simoniacal* contract. Bishop *Gibson** contends that this oath, whether interpreted by the plain tenor of it, or according to the language of former oaths, in the notions of the catholic church, concerning simony, is against all promises whatsoever; and he states that in the year 1391, in Archbishop *Courtenay's* decree against choppe churches, the oath is—"Quodque obligati non sunt nec eorum amici pro se juratoriâ aut pecuniariâ cautione de ipsis beneficiis resignandis vel permutandis." But I should conclude, by the omission of this part of the oath in the canons of 1603, it was intended that it should no longer be included, or at least that it was considered as not being included; for in the Irish canons, which were made thirty-one years afterwards, it was provided that if any clerk or other, with his consent, should seal any bond, or sell to any person or persons, with condition of resignation of his benefice, he shall be holden guilty of simony, and proceeded against according to the severity of the ancient canons in that behalf.

As another ground of objection to these bonds, it is asked what power is there after the resignation made, to compel the patron to present the person in whose favor it is made, or to compel such person to accept it,

* Codex, p. 802.

or having been instituted, to prevent his resigning the benefice to a vendee immediately afterwards? and it is said that neither the Bishop nor the Chancellor can compel such presentation to be made. To this I answer, that the resignation is to be made to the Bishop. Upon its being tendered, he has a right to inquire into the reason of it, and upon finding it is the consequence of a resignation bond, or any other engagement to resign, he may say he will not accept the resignation, unless the patron comes at the same time prepared to make the presentation: where the party who presented is under age, at the time when the engagement is entered into, and as soon as he comes of age procures himself to be admitted into priest's orders, it is a pretty strong proof of his readiness to accept the living. With respect to the second part of the offer to resign the living immediately, or within a very short time after institution, is a pretty strong proof of the resignation being obtained from an interested motive, and would probably induce the Bishop not to accept it. But the legality or illegality of the bond cannot depend on what course the Bishop would pursue, and the probability is that he would not refuse to act according to what the courts of law had decided upon the question. If any real inconvenience should be found, it would be in the power of the legislature to enact that the resignation shall be conditional only, and be void if the persons in whose favor it is made be not presented within a certain period. It certainly has been determined that the party does all he can to comply with the condition, by tendering his resignation; yet if the Bishop refuses to accept it, the bond is forfeited. But upon this I would observe, that if where the incumbent has done all he can to perform his obligation, the bond is still put in suit, it can only be for an unlawful purpose: in that case I apprehend a court of equity would grant an injunction.

To the observation that it may be difficult or impossible to ascertain the fact; the answer is, that if there is any suspicion respecting it, a Bill in Equity may be filed for a discovery, and if the discovery does not render the party liable to penalties, it will be ordered. This was done in the case of the *Bishop of London v. Ffytche*, and it is remarkable, that the noble and learned lord, who so ably, and so successfully, combated the legality of Resignation Bonds, while he was in the profession, adopted the doctrine of *Westminster Hall*, and had, in that very case, over-ruled a demurrer which had been pleaded, on the ground that a discovery might expose the parties to penalties, and which must have been allowed, had his lordship then been of opinion that the transaction was illegal.

I have cautiously abstained from entering into the question, how far bonds of this description are or are not consistent with public policy; and I have done so, because however proper, if the case were new and doubtful, it might be to take this question into consideration, yet if the case is not new, but such bonds have been held good for centuries, as it appears to me they have been, it is now too late to consider that question in a Court of Law, and if it is considered right to put a stop to them on the ground of public policy, the legislature are the pro-

* 1 Brown's Reports in Chancery, 96.

per persons to do so. Were the case new, I am not prepared to say it might not be proper to prevent the giving of these bonds; but if so, it seems to me that it would be the proper course to put an end to them altogether, and not to make a distinction in favour of those which it has been said are good because they only enforce the performance of those duties which are required by law to be performed. If the law requires the performance of a duty, why not trust the enforcing such performance to those authorities to which the law of the country has entrusted it, and who have the power of determining how far any regulations for the rigid performance may or may not be relaxed or dispensed with? Why is it necessary to call in the assistance of the patron, and give him the power of enforcing it by a more severe punishment than the law would inflict, and the inflicting of which would confer an advantage on the patron, which the ordinary process of the law would not give him.

With respect to one of the cases in which a bond of resignation has been allowed, namely, that of non-residence, I am not sure that the case stated upon that subject, does proceed from so pure a motive as has been attributed to it. Take for instance, the case of *Whiston v. Partridge*, before cited. The condition is, that the party shall reside, without absence of eighty days in *any one year*. When it is considered that at the period when this bond was entered into, absence of eighty days in the course of any one year put an end to any lease which might have been made of the tithes, or any part of the benefice, one is compelled to conjecture that there was some other reason for the insertion of that provision, than the good of the church, or the punctual performance by the incumbent of the duties of his situation.

I forbear, however, to say more upon this topic, because, as it appears to me, the practice of giving these bonds has too long prevailed, and has been too often recognized as legal, to permit it to be altered by any other than legislative authority. For these reasons, and upon the most attentive and full consideration I have been able to give to the authorities, I feel myself bound to state my humble opinion:—That sufficient matter does not appear upon the record to show that either by the statute or common law, the bond upon which the action of the Defendant in error was brought in the court below stated upon the Record to bear equal date with the Writing of Presentation therein mentioned, is void and illegal.

Mr. Baron Hullock.—After much reflection and research upon the subject, I have arrived at a different conclusion from that which is the result of the deliberation of my learned brother. But I concur in the opinion which has been stated, and which I have reason to believe is the opinion also of all the learned Judges now present; that this record discloses sufficient matter to show, that the Bond in question was given in consideration of, and as the price of the Presentation of the Plaintiff in error to the Rectory of Kettering. For a considerable time I felt much difficulty on this part of the case; because, although no plain unlettered man can peruse the condition of this bond without, as it seems to me, at once perceiving that such was the fact; yet still it appeared to me to be

doubtful whether that conclusion was more than an inference which, however well warranted in ordinary cases of construction, was yet insufficient, in the absence of distinct and positive averment, to warrant a Court of Law in acting upon it, in a case where the question is, whether the parties to the contract have acted in contravention or violation of the enactment of a penal statute. In all cases in which the charge involves in it a breach or violation of a penal statute, it is essentially necessary that the act charged should be brought by express and positive allegations within the language and letter of the statute. I apprehend that if the defendant below had, in this case, been advised to have pleaded specially, instead of suffering judgment to go against him by default, his plea would have shewn by precise and positive allegations, that this bond was given in consideration of and for and as the price of the presentation, and that the presentation was made or conferred in consideration of and in return for the bond. A plea so framed would, if established in point of fact, have brought the case directly and unequivocally within the language of the statute.* Further reflection, however, and opportunities of conversing upon the subject, have satisfied me, that it is clear, from the language of the condition itself, that this bond was given in consideration of and for the presentation, and that the presentation was made in consideration of the bond: in short, that this instrument was the result of barter and contract between the obligor and the obligee, for and in respect of this living.

The condition of the bond commences with a recital, that the obligee is the patron of the rectory of Kettering, which rectory was then vacant by the death of the late incumbent thereof—That the obligee, by writing under his hand and seal, bearing equal date with the bond, had presented the obligor to supply the said vacancy, and to be rector, in order that he might be instituted and inducted thereto; and that the obligee had agreed to resign the said rectory, upon such request or notice as thereafter mentioned, so as that the said rectory might thereby again become vacant, for the sole purpose, that the owner of the advowson of the said rectory might be enabled to present thereto one of two brothers of the obligee, therein specifically named, when the party to be presented should be capable of taking an ecclesiastical benefice.

Now can any person, after reading these passages, from the condition of the bond, have a doubt of the nature and character of this contract? Assuming, then, that it is sufficiently evident, by the matter appearing on this record, that the bond in question constituted the consideration for this presentation, is it an instrument avoided by the statute?† By the fifth section of that statute, “If any person shall or do, for any sum of money, reward, gift, profit, or benefit, directly or indirectly, or for or by reason of any promise, agreement, grant, bond, covenant, or other assurance of or for any sum of money, reward, gift, profit, or benefit, whatsoever, directly or indirectly, present or collate any person to any benefice, with cure of souls; or give, or bestow, the same for or in respect of any such corrupt cause or consideration; that then every such presentation, and every admission, institution and induction thereupon,

* 31 Eliz. cap. 6. sec. 1. 5.

† 31 Eliz.

shall be utterly void and of no effect in law." And the Act then proceeds to subject the parties to certain forfeitures and incapacities.

By the word "Corrupt," as used here, and as applied to this subject, it is quite clear, that every presentation, which is not gratuitous, is corrupt. By the former part of the clause, presentations, for money, &c., "are prohibited; and, by the latter part of this section, presentations, made for such corrupt cause, are avoided; clearly considering such cause, that is, a bond, &c., made for the presentation, to be a corrupt cause. And the statute was intended, (as appears by the preamble to the fifth section, which is printed incorrectly, at the end of the fourth,) for the avoiding of simony and corruption in presentations to benefices, &c.

It may be observed, that the statute does not in express words avoid the bond itself, but merely the presentation made in consequence of or under it. But still, upon general principles of law, I conceive it to be quite clear, that a bond made for the purpose of furthering an object prohibited by a statute is void, and can never be made the foundation of an action: and this doctrine is laid down in the clearest manner, by Lord Holt, in *Bartlett v. Viner*.* In that case, that learned Judge expresses himself thus: "Every contract, made for or about any matter or thing, which is prohibited and made unlawful by any statute, is a void contract; though the statute itself doth not mention that it shall be so, but only inflicts a penalty on the offender; because a penalty implies a prohibition, though there are no prohibitory words in the statute: as, for instance, in the case of simony, the statute only inflicts a penalty by way of forfeiture, but doth not mention any avoiding of the simoniacal contract; yet it hath always been held, that such contracts, being against law, are void."

The inquiry, then, will be, whether a bond of this description be a benefit, either directly or indirectly, to the patron; because, if it be, it will fall immediately within the words and operation of the statute; and any presentation made for such a bond will be void.

It is denied that this security is either a profit or a benefit in the true spirit and intendment of this clause of the statute.

If the judgment of the Court below is sustained, the obligee would be entitled to take out execution upon his judgment for the sum of £12,000, with his costs of suit. A right to enforce the payment of such a sum of money looks like a profit, like a benefit, it appears difficult to raise a serious doubt upon the question. The opportunity afforded by this species of bond of providing for a son, or a brother, or relation, must surely be considered a benefit to a patron. If it be a benefit, how has it been acquired? why by means of a corrupt bargain for the presentation.

But consider this contract in another point of view. It is not compulsory on the obligor to resign, he has an option either to do so or to pay the penalty, and, as has been well observed by Eyre, B.† in the *Bishop of London v. Fytche*, "Is the chance that the obligor (who may) will so elect worth nothing to the obligee? The obligor may resign or pay the money, and the obligee cannot, at all events, compel him to resign. If that be so, what would be easier than the making of this spe-

* Carth. 252.

† Cunningham, 52.

cies of contract the means of selling an advowson during an actual vacancy? The value of the living is calculated,—a bond is given for the amount, conditioned to be void if the incumbent resigns on request, when a certain specified individual has become capable of taking the living. That event happens almost immediately by the nomination of a person who, if he lived, would, within a very few months, become capable of holding an ecclesiastical benefice. The incumbent is called on to resign: he refuses, but prevents a suit on the bond by paying to the obligee the amount of the penalty. Would not such a proceeding, if this bond be legal, operate a benefit to the patron for and in respect of his presentation; but whether the money or the resignation of the living is obtained, the obligee acquires to himself a benefit in every sense of that word for his presentation.

It has been however argued, as it was said in the *Bishop of London v. Ffytche*, that the word “benefit” in the 6th section of the 31 *Eliz.* c. 6. cannot be construed according to its ordinary meaning, inasmuch as such a construction would have the effect of rendering the 8th section of the statute nugatory. The true answer to that sort of reasoning is given by Mr. Baron *Eyre* in the case of the *Bishop of London v. Ffytche*. It appears to me that the word “benefit” in the 8th section of the act must receive the same meaning as it possesses in the 6th clause of the act. The word “benefit” in the 8th section means something ultra, something in addition to the value of the thing exchanged. In exchanges neither living can be considered as better or worse in legal intendment, because they are, in the estimation of those that make them, perfectly equal, however other persons may differ upon the subject. Mr. Baron *Eyre* puts the case thus: “A living in the air of Berkshire may be reckoned an equivalent for the difference in value of an incumbency in the Hundreds of Essex.” That is a fair argument. Each man throws into the scale circumstances which establish a perfect equilibrium in cases of exchange between parties. In a case where there is not a single shilling passing, if there is any other extrinsic benefit whatsoever to the smallest amount, it is made a part in the consideration of such exchange, and there is no question that upon this act of parliament such exchange will be void. Since the decision in the *Bishop of London v. Ffytche*, we are bound to say that a general bond of resignation is bad in point of law. That decision must have proceeded either on the ground that such a bond was a benefit to the patron, and therefore prohibited by the statute, or that such a bond was void on grounds of public policy. It was contrary to the policy of the law to permit the incumbent of a living to be placed under such a controul as must necessarily result from such an instrument. In *Legh v. Lewis*, 1 East, 398, Mr. Justice *Le Blanc* says, that the decision in the *Bishop of London v. Ffytche* against the validity of general bonds turned ultimately on the ground of their being simoniacal and against the statute. If the decision alluded to proceeded on that ground, then I would humbly ask, on what principle or ground of reason can the effect of the bond now in judgment be distinguished from the effect of a general resignation bond? The benefit or value of the two bonds may differ in amount or degree: a special bond may not be so

beneficial or so valuable as a general resignation bond, but that is a mere difference in the degree, not a difference in the nature, or essence, or character of the instrument. I am unable to comprehend any other way in which a difference can be predicated between these two descriptions of bonds. No ingenuity, no subtlety that can be employed on the subject, can succeed in establishing any other distinction between general and special bonds of resignation; and if the facts disclosed upon this record are adverted to, the absolute identity of these bonds in principle and operation will be most palpable. One of the nominees in the bond is now competent to hold an ecclesiastical benefice. But the patron cannot be compelled by any mode or way which any lawyer can point out, to make the request or give the notice mentioned in the bond. That being the case at the commencement of the suit below, the obligor stood precisely in the same situation as an obligor in a general bond would be in the moment after he had executed that description of bond.

If, then, general bonds of resignation were decided to be bad, as being contrary to the statute of *Eliz.* on the ground of their operating as a benefit to the patron; it seems to me more than difficult to contend with success, that a special bond, operating in the same way, can be supported as an efficient instrument. If both species of bonds operate as benefits to the patron, though not to the same extent in point of value, they still must operate equally in violation and contravention, of the provisions of the statute.

But it has been argued, that, admitting the case of the Bishop of *London v. Ffytche* to be law, yet, inasmuch as it was decided, as it has been strenuously alleged in direct contravention of a long train of decisions in the Court below; that case ought not be carried beyond the strict letter of the decision, and that, therefore, your Lordships will restrict its operation to general bonds of resignation merely.

In confirmation of this view of the subject, it is said these special bonds of resignation have been holden valid and unimpeachable at several times, and by several judges, and in several decisions in the Courts below, since, and notwithstanding the determination in the Bishop of *Landon v. Ffytche*. It cannot be dissembled, that, since the decision so often referred to, resignation bonds with special conditions have been treated on several occasions as legal instruments in the Courts below. It may be, therefore, material to advert to the modern cases in which this question has been agitated, and it will be found, and it is a most singular fact, that in no case since the determination in the Bishop of *London v. Ffytche*, has the construction of the statute of *Eliz.* ever been the question before the Court.

The first case of which I am aware in which the Bishop of *London v. Ffytche* is mentioned is, *Bagshaw v. Batley, Clerk*;* that was a bond given by the incumbent to the patron on presentation to reside on the living, or to resign it if he did not return to it after notice, and also not to commit waste, &c. in the parsonage-house, and it was held good. In giving judgment, Lord *Kenyon* said, "this bond was only entered into for the purpose of securing a performance of all those duties, which by

* 4 T. R. 78.

law, and without the bond, he was bound to discharge." He then proceeded thus: "I avoid saying any thing about the case of the Bishop of *London v. Ffytche*; when that question comes again before the House of Lords, they will, I have no doubt, review the former decision, if it should become necessary. It is sufficient for me to say, that this case cannot be governed by that." Mr. Justice *Buller* said, "I cannot find any immorality or illegality in this bond. It is the duty of the incumbent to reside on this living, and to be regular in the discharge of his duty. Now this bond requires nothing more. It only requires him to do what the law would have compelled him to do without it."

The next case is *Partridge v. Whiston, Clerk*;* that was an action of debt upon a bond conditioned:—to reside; to resign for the patron's son to be presented; and to keep the premises on the living in repair. In that case the defendant pleaded two pleas to the bond; and the question now before your Lordships might, as it would seem, have been raised on the first special plea, which set out the condition upon oyer; and this in effect averred, that the presentation was given in consideration of the defendant's entering into the bond to resign the living upon the plaintiff's son taking priests' orders. To this plea there was a demurrer and joinder. But the Court, understanding that it was intended to carry the case up to this House, gave judgment for plaintiff without argument. They said, as this was not precisely similar to the Bishop of *London v. Ffytche*, they were bound, by the established series of precedents, to give judgment for the plaintiff. In this case, therefore, the construction of the statute of Eliz. is never once thought of.

The next case to which I call the attention of your Lordships, though not in order of time, is that of *Newman v. Newman*.† That was debt on bond, conditioned:—to pay money to the obligée upon the conveyance of an estate to the obligor, and to present the obligée's son to the next avoidance of a church, the advowson of which belonged to the estate, if he were then of age to take it, or if not to procure the person who should be presented to resign, upon notice of the son's being qualified to take it, and to present him. These facts appeared on oyer of the bond, and were alleged to be simoniacal; there were a demurer and joinder; and the Court decided that, as the bond was conditioned for the performance of several things, some of which were good, the bond was valid, although one of them might be void at the common law; after argument Lord *Ellenborough* said, "What the effect of a bond of resignation in favour of a son might be, was not, I believe, touched upon in the Bishop of *London v. Ffytche*, though, perhaps, it might be argued that there is no reason for any distinction, because a parent would be more open to prejudice and improper bias in favour of a son than of any other person." Mr. Justice *Le Blanc* said, "The reason for making an exception in favour of a condition for presenting a son might be, because it was not for a money consideration."

Mr. Justice *Dampier* said, "A stipulation to resign in favour of a specified person, does not seem to be open to the same objection as if it were to resign generally, because the latter makes the incumbent a mere

* 4 T. R. 359.

† 4 Maule v. Selwyn, 66:

tenant at will to the patron. I know that since the case of the Bishop of *London v. Efythe*, it has been considered that bonds of resignation in favour of certain specified persons are not illegal." In this case, the judgment is given on that part of the condition of the bond which was holden good, and no judgment was given on the part of the record applicable to this question, and the opinion of Lord *Ellenborough* seems rather against the validity of special bonds of resignation as not distinguishable from general bonds. Mr. Justice *Le Blanc*'s opinion proceeds entirely on the ground of a special bond of resignation not being for a money consideration, and therefore not bad. But the statute law is not confined to money considerations. Mr. Justice *Dampier* seems to consider special bonds good; but his reasoning is equally applicable to both descriptions of bonds; and if his reasoning be correct, this bond is bad, because clearly here the obligor is at this moment tenant at will, &c.

In *Legh v. Lewis*,* this species of bond was touched upon, though not the point in judgment. That was the case of a bond given by a school-master, of an ancient public school, who had, as it was said, a freehold in his office, to resign at the request of his patron; the Court held the bond good. The question arose upon a demurrer to a plea which after oyer stated all the facts on the record. In giving his judgment Lord *Kenyon* says, "I never can admit that at common law, a general resignation bond of an office is illegal, although a party may have a freehold in the office. In the instance of ecclesiastical livings that is universally the case, every rector has a freehold in his rectory, yet it was never doubted, but that resignation bonds for certain purposes and up to a certain extent at least were binding, though they put an end to the freehold." Mr. Justice *Lawrence* expressed great doubts on this question. Mr. Justice *Le Blanc* agreed with Lord *Kenyon*, that the bond in that case was good; he thought it fell within the principle of the former determinations, that general bonds of resignation were good at law. I shall, however, have occasion to advert again to this decision.

I am not aware of any other case upon this subject. From this review of the modern cases, it is quite impossible to say that any question concerning the validity of special bonds of resignation has ever come neatly before any of the Courts below, with the exception of *Partridge v. Whiston*, in which a formal judgment was given in support of such a bond without argument, for the purpose of a writ of error. What became of that case I do not know.

It has been seen then that no well grounded argument in support of a special bond of resignation can be drawn from modern cases: and it will be found, I believe, that the more ancient ones are equally destitute of general reasoning on the subject. If any one will take the trouble of toiling through the old cases in this matter, he will not, I believe, find any decision in which the validity of either species of bond has been discussed or argued on general reasoning, either on the statute or common law.

For these reasons, therefore, it appears to me that I ought to answer the question proposed to the judges in the affirmative; that sufficient

* 1 E. 391.

matter appears upon the record to shew that by the statute law the bond in question is void and illegal. But assuming that the decision in the *Bishop of London v. Ffytche* proceeded on the ground that the bond in that case was void, as being contrary to public policy, although it might not be a benefit within, or contrary to, the provisions of the statute of *Elizabeth*, I am disposed to maintain, that the bond in this case operates equally against public policy, and is therefore on that ground equally void and illegal.

Bonds of this description had no existence at the common law, because it was not until a period long subsequent to legal memory that the right of patronage, in the manner in which it now generally obtains, had its origin; but still these bonds, if they operate to the prejudice or detriment of the public interests, are contrary to the common law, inasmuch as every bond or contract which operates against the public convenience, or to the public prejudice, is, upon the principles of the common law, void and of no effect. This doctrine is familiar to every one, and is recognized and illustrated in the case of *Collins v. Blantern*.*

If no authorities could be found on the subject; if the question were *res integra*, few persons, I think, would contend that this species of instrument given in consideration of and for the presentation to an ecclesiastical living, is capable of being supported on sound principles of law.

Before the *Bishop of London v. Ffytche*, numerous cases occur in the books upon the subject; but no one of them, as far as my researches enable me to speak, contains any reasoning or argument in support of these bonds. The authority of these cases seems to depend mainly upon tradition; certainly more upon positive authority than good reasoning. In the latter cases, the judges, whilst they seem to admit that if the question were new, the validity of these instruments could not be supported, decide upon authority merely, and refuse to hear any argument upon this subject.

In 12 Mod. 504. 13 W. 3. P. Mr. Justice *Powell* expressed an opinion against resignation bonds, if the authorities had not bound him. He says, that when first the judges held these bonds good, if they had foreseen the mischief of them, they would have been of a contrary opinion. The same opinion is expressed on this subject by Mr. Justice *Buller* in the *Bishop of London v. Ffytche*, when that case came before the Court below;† and afterwards, when that case was before your Lordships, the same learned judge says, that he had taken no small pains to find out upon what principle all the cases had gone, but without much effect; for after all the labour he had bestowed upon the subject, it seemed to him they were destitute of all sense, reason, and principle. And in *Legh v. Lewis*,‡ Mr. Justice *Lawrence* says, speaking of general resignation bonds, it must be admitted, that if it were a new question at this day, it would be very difficult to say upon principle, that such bonds could be legal, and an opinion in accordance with those to which I have just adverted has been oftener than once expressed by the highest living authority. On several occasions the noble and learned Lord to whom I allude has expressed himself unfavourable to those bonds upon principle.

* 2 Wils. 348.

† 1 East, 494.

‡ 1 Est, 396.

He has declared, that the only perplexity he has experienced on the question has arisen from the authorities. No one who has taken the trouble of wading through the cases which are to be found in the books upon the subject of bonds of resignation will, I think, be disposed to question the accuracy of the conclusion at which Mr. Justice *Buller* states himself to have arrived from a perusal of those cases. That learned judge declared, that the cases appeared to him to be destitute of all reason, sense, and principle. Your Lordships are, however, vehemently called upon to found your decision upon the present occasion on the authority of such cases.

With respect, however, to general bonds of resignation, the more ancient cases no longer exist as authorities upon the subject, and upon what view of the subject can either the ancient or modern cases be considered as authorities in support of special bonds of resignation? I would ask, upon what principle can a special bond of resignation be sustained, I mean with reference to public policy? It may be worth while to advert for a moment to the nature and extent of the estate and interest which a rector has in point of law in his rectory after institution and induction.

Few lawyers will be disposed to deny that by institution and induction a rector becomes seised of a freehold estate for his life in the parsonage house, the glebe, and the tithes of his rectory. The authorities are numerous and uniform on the point,* and distinctly stated by Lord *Kenyon*, in *Lekh v. Lewis*, and by Lord *Thurlow* in the *Bishop of London v. Ffytche*.

In pleading, which is the best evidence of the law, a rector states that he is rector, &c. and as such rector that he was, and thence hitherto hath been and still is seised in his demesne as of freehold, in right of his said rectory of, and in the tenements, &c., and being so seised, &c. If a rector, by virtue of institution and induction, acquires an estate for life, from whom does he derive it? not from the patron, but from the ordinary. The patron has purely the right of nomination or presentment. That is the whole of the *jus patronatus*. The office is not in any sense conferred by the patron; it proceeds entirely from the act of the bishop. Then, upon what principle can it be justified at common law, that the patron shall be permitted to exact a security in derogation of this freehold estate, the effect of which will be the converting a life estate into an estate at will. In the *Bishop of London v. Ffytche*, Lord *Thurlow* asks whether a bond of resignation, given by a judge or a master in Chancery, would be good. He says a master in Chancery is an officer appointed for life. Suppose the Chancellor has the appointment, and suppose such master gives a bond to resign when called upon, would that bond be good at common law? No, because it is not only contrary to the constitution of his office, but because the public has an interest in the independence of that officer, as being appointed for life, and a public law officer. His place is independent, it being *quam diu se bene gesserit*. If he is an officer for life, how can any private man whatsoever, because it is his province to appoint him, take upon him to render that officer's

* Wils. 347. Gibs. 661. Cro. Jac. 367. Noy, 104.

situation what the law says it shall not be? He apprehended it would be extremely difficult to justify those bonds. This reasoning is applicable *à fortiori* to bonds like those now under consideration; and the difficulty of supporting a bond of resignation, which, in effect, reduced a freehold office to a mere estate at will, is adverted to by Mr. Justice *Lawrence*, in *Legh v. Lewis*.* I have already had occasion to observe, that that was the case of a bond of resignation by a schoolmaster. There Mr. Justice *Lawrence*, after observing that it did not precisely appear on the pleadings, whether the office was a freehold office, says, that he had considerable doubts on the question, how far the person, who has the power of such appointment, could exercise it in a different manner from what the founder intended.

It may be added, that when the case of *Legh v. Lewis*† came on for argument afterwards, on a Writ of Error in the Exchequer Chamber, the Court were clearly of opinion, that it did not sufficiently appear on the record, that the office of school-master was such an office as ought for the sake of the public, to be deemed a freehold office; and that therefore it was impossible to raise the important question which it was the intention of the parties to litigate, upon which question they declined giving any opinion. Hence it may be collected, that in a clear case of a freehold, (like the present case,) the invalidity of such a bond was considered, by the Court, a question of great difficulty and importance: and the difficulty of establishing a bond to resign a freehold office, at the instance of the person making the appointment, is suggested in *Laying v. Paine*.‡ That case, it is true, arose on the statute of 5th and 6th Edw. 6. c. 15, against the sale of offices; but still the language of the Lord Chief Justice is extremely applicable to this subject. He says, "I think this is a void condition (a condition to resign the office of Registrar of the Archdeaconry of Wells); for the donor to oblige the officer to surrender whenever he requires it, is to reserve to himself an absolute power over his officer, which he ought not to do: besides, if this were allowed, there would be a plain method chalked out to evade the statute; for any one, by this means, might sell an office for its full value; and such indisputably would be the consequence of supporting the present bond."

In *Newman v. Newman*,§ in speaking of a special bond of resignation, Mr. Justice *Dampier* observes, that such a bond does not seem to be open to the same objection as if it were to resign generally, because the latter makes the incumbent but a mere tenant at will to the patron. Now if that reasoning be sound, it applies directly to the facts disclosed on the record. It is averred, that one of the nominees in the bond has become capable of taking an ecclesiastical benefice, of consequence the time has arrived at which the obligee may call for a resignation, according to the condition of the bond; but the obligee is not, therefore, obliged to take that step; he may do so, or he may let it alone. If that be so at the time of the commencement of the action in the court below, the obligor was a mere tenant at will to the patron. If he be allowed to retain the living, he would do so by the permission of the patron, and

* 1 East. 396. † 3 Bos. and Pul. 231. ‡ Wils. 571. § 4 Maule and Selw. 71.

he would hold it on the tenure of the patron's mere will and pleasure. Can any one, then, seriously contend that the condition of this bond, which places the incumbent in such complete thralldom, under so absolute a dominion and restraint, can be supported upon any known or recognized principle of law? The inevitable consequences of such a state of things are too palpable and gross to be dwelt upon for a moment. Such a bond must necessarily operate to the prejudice, if not the total subversion, of the true and essential interests of religion.

Suppose the clerk should resign in conformity to the condition of a bond of this sort, what obligation is there upon the obligee to present the individual specified in the condition? None. He may give the living to a stranger; and if the patron should present a stranger to the living, would the obligor have any remedy, either at law or in equity, against the obligee, for the nonpresentation of the nominee in the bond? I should be curious to learn the precise species of remedy or redress, to which an obligor would, under such circumstances, be entitled. Again, there is no obligation upon the nominee to accept the living if it should be offered to him.

How can a clerk, after entering into a bond of this description, honestly take the oath which is administered to him previous to institution? * how can he sign his resignation in the form usually adopted? † If the ordinary permit him to resign, (which by the way he is not bound to do). The words of resignation, according to Gibsons, ‡ are “ex certa scientia pure sponte simpliciter et absolute resigno.”

If the acceptance of the ordinary be necessary to give effect to the resignation, the undertaking of a clerk to resign a benefice is an undertaking which he has no power of himself to perform, because it depends on the ordinary, whether he will accept the resignation or not.

Another objection arises, on the ground of general policy, to this species of instrument; the patron becomes thereby precluded from choosing the most proper individual for supplying the living. If he act in the presentation according to the condition of the bond, his choice is fixed long before the fitness of the object can be ascertained. At the execution of the bond the nominee may be at college, or perhaps at school, or perhaps in his cradle.

Numberless other objections might be pointed out to this species of bond; but having already occupied too much time, I will conclude by stating it to be my opinion that this bond is void and illegal.

The old cases, as to general bonds of resignation, were overturned by the final decision in the case of *The Bishop of London v. Ffytche*; and as there is not, as far as I am able to comprehend the subject, any rational distinction between the two descriptions of bonds in their operation and consequences, I conceive that special bonds of resignation are equally destitute of principle and authority. I therefore am bound to say that, in my judgment, sufficient matter appears upon the record to show that, by the common law, this bond is void and illegal.

* Gibs, 802. 810.

† Ib. 1518.

‡ Ib. 851. 1518.

Lord Chief Justice Best.—The question is, “Whether sufficient matter appears upon the record to show that, either by statute or common law, the bond upon which the action of debt was brought in this case, and stated upon the record to bear even date with the writing of presentation therein mentioned, is void or illegal? I will not detain the House by any technical observations on the point, whether the supposed objection to the bond be raised by the pleadings in this cause, because I am of opinion that, if it had been expressly stated on the record that the plaintiff in error was presented to the living of *Kettering* on the condition of his giving a bond to resign, to the intent and for the sole and only purpose (in the language of the bond) that the defendant in error might be enabled to present one of his younger brothers, when such brother should be capable of being inducted into such living, the bond would not have been void, either by the statute or common law. But for the judgment of this House in the case of the Bishop of *London v. Ffytche*, I will venture to say there never was a lawyer, from the time when tithes were first granted the church to the present, that would not, without hesitation, have given the same answer. It is now, however, thought by some of my learned brothers, that resignation bonds in favor of particular persons, although sanctioned by judges, bishops, and chancellors, are void, that the condition of resigning benefices is repugnant to the estate which incumbents have in them, and therefore bonds containing such a condition are void by the common law; that such bonds are benefits to the patron, and subject the givers and takers of them to all the penalties of the statute for the prevention of simony; that they cause the ministers of the Gospel to take false oaths, and are therefore not to be endured in a Christian community.

My Lords, although I most sensibly feel the weight of the authority to which my humble opinion is opposed, yet, supported by two of my learned brothers, I am vain enough to think we shall satisfy your Lordships that such bonds are liable to none of these objections. The judgment in the Bishop of *London* and *Ffytche* has not decided, nor did the House intend, in that case, to decide this question; but it has been insisted, in argument, that the principle which that case establishes, governs this. My first duty will be to show, that that case establishes no principle that, by fair legal reasoning, can be applied to the present. I have not, therefore, to express the hope which Lord Kenyon expressed, * that your Lordships will review that decision, I have only to request that the principle on which that judgment rests may not be extended further than those who pronounced it intended it ever should be, and that it may not be applied to cases which cannot be productive of the evils which it was their object to remedy. Thus much I might ask, although disposed to admit what has always appeared to me repugnant to reason and authority, namely, that a supreme court of justice cannot undo what it has erroneously done. Although the courts below will not impugn your Lordships’ judgments, in cases *ad idem*, yet they do not hold that they are bound by them beyond the point actually decided. The Courts below truly say, we cannot know that the House of Lords would carry this determination

* 4 Term Reports, 81.

farther than they have carried it. In the case of *Partridge and Weston*,* the Court of King's Bench said, "that a bond to resign in favour of the son of the patron did not raise a point precisely like that in the Bishop of *London* and *Ffytche*, and they were bound, by the established series of precedents, to give judgment for the plaintiff." This decision, although pronounced on a point appearing on the record, and therefore liable to be disputed in this House, was never disturbed.

In the Bishop of *London* and *Ffytche*, the point decided was, that a presentation was void which was made in consideration of a bond given by the presentee to the patron, by which the former bound himself to the latter, absolutely to resign the living on request made to him by the patron to make such resignation. The question in this case is, whether a bond given by the presentee to the patron, to perform an agreement made between them, that the former would resign the living to the latter, to the intent, and for the sole and only purpose, that the latter might present one of his brothers when such brother shall be capable of taking an ecclesiastical benefice, is valid.

The reverend prelates, who favoured the House with their opinions in the case of the Bishop of *London* and *Ffytche*, although they expressed doubts of the legality of bonds in any form or under any circumstances, confined their judgments to general bonds, and all their reasoning went to prove the impolicy of general bonds only. The Bishop of *Bangor* says, "I am inclined to think that bonds of resignation, whether the condition be special or general, are within the express letter of the statute of Elizabeth, because it is impossible to conceive how a presentee can, in any instance, give a bond of resignation to a patron from which the patron will not derive some benefit or reward directly or indirectly." This is but an inclination of opinion, not a decided judgment; and I would beg to observe, that if the principle of some benefit, direct or indirect, be adopted, (a principle altogether inconsistent with the legal construction of penal statutes,) many most conscientious patrons, as well ecclesiastical as lay, have committed the detestable crime of simony. The Bishop of *Bangor* says, "if a bond of any sort can be said to be without exception." Except these expressions of dislike of any bonds of resignation, all the observations of the reverend prelates are directed against general, and general bonds only. The Bishop of *Salisbury* says, "general bonds of resignation have usually been given, and from the instant they are given, the wretched presentee is taken from under the protection of that law which guards every other subject of the state. He ceases to be free, because he holds his living at the absolute will of his patron, subject to his caprice." The Bishop of *Bangor* (except in the passage before cited) speaks always of general bonds: "Suppose," says his Lordship, "that the patron presents a clerk to a benefice without receiving any money-bond or assurance for money, but the clerk enters into a bond to resign on six months notice. As soon as he is in possession, the patron demands a lease of certain tithes at an under-rent." His Lordship sums up his argument by saying, "the worst and most corrupt practices may be carried on under general bonds of resignation." The Bishop of *Landaff* speaks of

* 4 Term Reports, 360.

general bonds only. The Bishop of *Gloucester* says,* “a bond which conceals the consideration for which it was given, and which may easily be abused to the most oppressive and iniquitous purposes, affords a strong suspicion of a bad design. If the consideration were a good one, why is it not expressed, as in special bonds it always is, in plain words?” Although these learned prelates, from a proper regard for the independence of the clergy and a jealousy of what they thought interfered with the authority of their order, disliked all resignation bonds, yet, it is clear, that they only decidedly condemned general bonds. The Bishop of *Gloucester* distinctly admits not only the legality but the propriety of some special bonds of resignation.

The reasoning of *Lord Thurlow* goes only to impugn general bonds; nobody (he says) contends that the practice is not wicked, destructive, and pernicious to the discipline of the church, and contrary to the spirit of the law under which it was carried on. He could produce evidence of an offer to sell an advowson, upon which the purchase money was calculated, and put on a general bond of resignation (no such arrangement could be made on a special bond): and he knew that instances of it were frequent.† Your Lordships are aware that *Lord Thurlow* had recently changed his opinion. When the Bishop of *London* and *Ffytche* came before him in the Court of Chancery, that learned Lord said, If there were no cases, I should think it clear that a mere bond for resignation could not be criminal, unless it were a profit or benefit to the patron. Many cases have determined that these bonds were good: the effect of the determination is, that they are not simoniacal, nor against the policy of the law.‡ His Lordship’s argument in the House of Lords, so far from proving that bonds to resign in favour of a son or a brother, (which no reasonable man could say are wicked and pernicious to the discipline of the Church, and could be made use of to enable sales of benefices,) are illegal, shows that general bonds of resignation, although under circumstances voidable in Chancery, are not void at common law. He says, “The bond is not capable of being avoided but by averments of bad considerations and use, if you cannot aver upon in that manner, whatever the Canon Law may do with it, by the Common Law it cannot be rescinded.”§ His Lordship then compares them to marriage brokerage bonds, and says, “abundant cases may be put to show that it is impossible to avoid those bonds at law,” and refers to the case of *Hall v. Potter*, decided in this House, in confirmation of his opinion. If I understand this argument, it is not that every general bond is void at law, but that it may be avoided if a bad use be made of it. *Lord Mansfield* says, “The case stands singly on this proposition—whether an agreement by a general bond of resignation, in consideration of a presentation, was by 31 *Eliz.* simoniacal, corrupt, and void.” I hope I have clearly shown, from the pleadings, the questions put to the Judges, and the opinions of the Judges and Members of this House, that the question now submitted to us by your Lordships, is not touched by the judgment in the Bishop of *London* v. *Ffytche*. It has been stated that special bonds differ only in form from

* Page 151.

† Cuninghame, 156.

‡ 1 Brown, 98.

§ Cuninghame, 158.

general bonds; that the condition to resign may be in favour of such as are neither the children nor relations of the patron; that if the names of two persons may be introduced into such bonds, the names of any greater number of persons may be inserted. Put into a special bond as many names as you please, you can no more make it, in form or substance, like a general bond, than by adding equal to unequal numbers you can make the totals equal. You cannot by a special bond reduce the incumbent to the same state of dependence on the caprice of the patron, as by a general bond; you cannot render it available to accomplish the sale of a benefice as you can a general bond. If a living be vacant, it cannot be sold; but if general bonds were permitted, the patron might present to the vacant benefice, take a general bond of resignation from the presentee, and when he has got his price for the benefice, call on the incumbent to resign, and thus, as Lord *Thurlow* says, he may calculate the purchase money on a general bond of resignation. The patron cannot make this calculation on a special bond, even if he be not obliged to present on the resignation of the incumbent the person mentioned in the bond, and on whose behalf the resignation is called for. If a special bond can be made use of to evade the penalties of the statute of *Elizabeth*, the taking it for such a purpose, if properly pleaded and proved, would render it void, and the insertion of an unusual number of names, and those persons not connected with the patron, would be evidence of such an intent.

I am not prepared to say that the persons in whose favour resignations are required must be relations of the patron. He may honestly think that a person who, from temporary infirmity, or absence, or from his not yet being in orders, is incapable of being presented to the living, will, when the disability shall be removed, be the fittest person to fill the church. But I think, that a patron may be compelled to present the person for the purpose of presenting whom he calls on the incumbent to resign; and that he may thus be prevented from making an improper use of the power given him by the bond; as my brother *Gaselee* has said, the Bishop may refuse to accept the resignation until he has in his hands the presentation of him in whose favour the resignation is required, or the incumbent may make a conditional resignation; such conditional resignations have been made where livings have been exchanged. *Sir Simon Degge* gives us the form of such a resignation, in which the Bishop is expressly required not to admit the other clerk, unless the exchange be completed, but to consider that resignation as of no effect. This agrees with the Common Law. Lord *Coke* says, "If two exchange lands, and one die before the exchange is executed, it is void." There are several instances in which Courts of Equity have interfered to prevent the making an ill use of these bonds. No case is to be found of an action at law; but as the loss of a benefice is the loss of a temporal advantage, otherwise the Court of Chancery could not have interfered, I should think that there could be no doubt that if a patron called on an incumbent to resign his benefice to the intent and for the sole and only purpose that he might present A. B., in favour of whom the patron had a right to call on the incumbent to resign, and after having obtained the resignation by such false pretence, he presented C. D., for whom the bond

did not authorize the patron to require a resignation, compensation for the injury the incumbent had sustained might be recovered in an action. If such an action be not maintainable, a man may, through fraud, sustain a temporal injury, and yet have no redress, which, I apprehend, would be inconsistent with the first principles of our law.

Although the validity of general bonds was supported in a great number of decided cases, there were some in which it was doubted, and others in which they were declared to be illegal. Lord Keeper *North* said he was not satisfied that such bonds were good in law: and in the case of *Graham v. Graham*, such bonds were holden to be within the statute of *Elizabeth*, by the Court of Common Pleas, in the 15th of *James I.* Where authorities clash, a Court of Error, at the same time that it confirms some judgments, must overrule such as are contrary to them; but where there is a long series of decisions, no authority can be opposed to them. I think a Court of Law cannot overturn them. The legality of special bonds is supported by decisions, both in Common Law Courts and Courts of Equity, from the time of *Henry IV.* to the present. In *Johns v. Lawrence*, it was recited on the bond that it was the intention of the obligee to preserve the presentation for his son, when he should be capable of taking the living; the obligor bound himself to resign within three months after request: the King's Bench first, and afterwards the Court of Exchequer Chamber, held, that a bond to resign on request, if the patron will present his son thereto, when he should be capable of taking the living, is good. This is the decision of all the Judges of England in the 8th of *James I.* Lord *Coke* was then Chief Justice of the King's Bench, and in his reading, on the statute of *Elizabeth*, he says that he was in parliament when that act passed; that he voted with the proceedings of the House, and he concurred with the other Judges that such a bond was valid. Can your Lordships have so safe a guide to lead you to the true meaning of the statute as one of the most eminent lawyers that ever lived, who took a part in the making the law—knew the evil that parliament meant to correct, and the exact extent to which it was intended the remedy should be carried? In *Hilliar and Stapleton*, Michaelmas, 1707, the Lord Keeper said, “Resignation bonds have been allowed since the statute only to preserve the living for the patron himself, or for a child, or to restrain the incumbent from non-residence, or a vicious course of life.” If the bond be general, his Lordship observes, a particular agreement must be proved to resign for the benefit of a friend that would be presented, and without such agreement the bond ought not to be sued on.

In *Pull and Capel*, 9 Geo. 1. the bond was to resign when the patron's nephew came of age: instead of the patron's requiring a resignation, an agreement was made that *Pull* should hold the living paying the nephew £30 a year. This payment was made for several years, but was afterwards refused, and the bond put in force. The chancellor granted an injunction, but said it was not on account of any defect in the bond, which he held good, but on account of the use that had been made of it.

In an *Anonymous* case in 13 W. 3. *Powell*, J. concurred with *Blencow*, the only other judge in court, in supporting a general bond, because, he

says, it may be to an honest intent, as that the patron may have a son of his own capable of taking the benefice ; but, says he, if this was the real motive, why should it not be expressed in the condition. This very learned judge entertained no doubt of the legality of special bonds or of the justice or policy of allowing them. In *Partridge* and *Weston* the Court of King's Bench said they were bound by an established series of precedents to give judgment for the plaintiff in an action on a bond on a condition to resign in favour of a son of the patron. This case might have been carried to the House of Lords, for the question was raised on the record, but the judgment was never disputed. To these decisions no judgment of any court, no *dictum* of any judge, can be opposed. The overruling of so many authorities by any power but that of the legislature will destroy entirely the certainty of the law—no man can know what are his rights or duties.

We talk much of national faith, I hope, my Lords, it will ever be kept inviolable ; national faith is not, however, confined to any particular compacts, it requires the strict observance of all laws under the sanction of which any of the subjects of this empire have acquired any rights. The reversal of these decisions would be a breach of national faith to those who have been induced by them to purchase advowsons ; for immense sums of money have been expended in buying advowsons and presentations upon the highest assurance next to that of an express declaration by the legislature, that in case of livings becoming vacant before those on whom the purchasers intended to bestow them are capable of taking orders, they might present to such livings and take the security of a bond from the presentees for the resignation of them when the person for whom they are intended shall be in priest's orders. Many of these purchasers have no other provision for their children but the living so purchased. Ecclesiastics, as well as laymen, have dealt in these bonds of resignation. Lord *Mansfield* says, a bishop of Salisbury, before his (Lord *Mansfield's*) time, frequently took them. This is not said of that right reverend prelate by way of reproach, but to show that men of the highest character did not consider that the taking such bonds was improper.

Your Lordships will permit me to remind you, that if you decide that these bonds are within the statute of Elizabeth, you make those who have given, and those who have taken them, criminals. Both the plaintiff and the defendant in error, and many other persons, as well clergymen as laymen, have, whilst acting under the sanction of the courts of Westminster, committed the scandalous crime of simony, and subjected themselves to all the penalties of the statute of Elizabeth. I am aware, my Lords, that this argument was answered in the Bishop of *London v. Fytche*, by saying, that these consequences of the judgment could be prevented by an act of parliament ; your Lordships cannot have forgotten the answer of Lord *Mansfield* to this observation : " What ! pass a judgment to do mischief and then bring in a bill to cure it ! " I will add, will you condemn men by a judgment that has all the vice of an *ex post facto* law, and after confiscating their property, save them from further punishment by a statute pardon ? But let us forget for a

moment that there are any decisions on the subject. The statute of Elizabeth cannot be holden to embrace this case without setting aside rules that since the Revolution have been uniformly observed by all judges, and which tempers with mercy the justice of our criminal law. The statute of Elizabeth is a penal law : the rule to which I allude requires that all penal laws should be construed strictly ; that no case should be holden to be reached by them but such as are within both the spirit and letter of such laws. If these rules are violated, the fate of accused persons is decided by the arbitrary discretion of judges, and not by the express authority of the laws. If general words follow an enumeration of particular cases, such general words are by another rule of construction holden to apply only to cases of the same kind as those which are expressly mentioned. By the 14th *Geo. 2. c. 1.* persons who should steal sheep or any other cattle were deprived of the benefit of clergy. The stealing of any cattle, whether commonable or not commonable, seems to be embraced by these general words "any other cattle." But by the 15th *Geo. 2. c. 34.* the legislature declared, that it was doubtful to what sorts of cattle the former act extended besides sheep, and enacted and declared, that the act was meant to extend to any bull, cow, ox, steer, bullock, heifer, calf, and lamb, as well as sheep, and to no other cattle whatsoever ; until the legislature distinctly specified what cattle were meant to be included the judges felt that they could not apply the statute to any other cattle but sheep. The legislature by the last act says, it was not to be extended to horses, pigs, or goats, although all these are cattle. Lord Chief Baron Comyn says, "A penal statute shall not be extended by equity, and the general words of a penal statute shall be restrained for the benefit of him against whom the penalty is inflicted."

By the 31 *Eliz. c. 6. s. 4.* "for the avoiding simony and corruptions in presentations, collations, and donations, of and to any benefices, dignities, prebends, and other livings and promotions ecclesiastical, and in admissions, institutions, and inductions, to the same, if any persons or person shall for any sum of money, reward, gift, profit, or benefit, directly or indirectly, or for or by reason of any promise, agreement, grant, bond, covenant, or other assurance, of or for any sum of money, reward, preferment, gift, profit, or benefit whatsoever, directly or indirectly, present or collate, any person to any benefice with cure of souls, dignity, or living, ecclesiastical, the presentation, collation, gift, and bestowing, and every admission, institution, investiture, and induction, shall be utterly void, frustrate, and of none effect in law, and the person giving or taking the money &c. shall forfeit double the value of one year's profit of the benefice, and the person accepting the benefice shall be for ever disabled from holding the same." The only words in this statute that can be so far stretched as to reach the bond which is the subject of the present action are "profit or benefit ;" but these, according to the restrictive rules of construing penal statutes, mean only profits or benefits *ejusdem generis* with money, rewards, or gifts, such as bills of exchange instead of money, leases of the tithes or profits of the benefice, or loans of money, or other valuables, for a long or indefinite period of time, instead

of immediate gifts of the same things. If this construction be not put on the words no patron either lay or ecclesiastical can present or collate a son who is dependent on such patron to any preferment in the Church without being guilty of simony. If a bond for the resignation of a living in favour of a son be a benefit; the presentation of a son to a vacant benefice must be a benefit, for the first is only a means of obtaining the second. Indeed, there can be no doubt that if a patron has a son whom he maintains, it is generally a benefit for him to have a living to which he can present such son; for few persons would allow a son as much after he was in possession of a benefice as he received before. But this was not that corrupt benefit which was contemplated by the legislature when this statute was passed. Whatever expressions are to be found in the act, the object of the legislature was only to prevent simony, and such advantages as these were never thought to be simoniacal.

Lord Chief Justice *De Grey* says, in 2 *Blackstone's Reports*, 1052, the statute has not adopted all the wild notions of the canon law with regard to simony, but the giving or granting this bond would not amount to simony even by the canon law; the words which approach nearest to it are those of the canon of 1229:—*Nulli licet ecclesiam nomine dotulitatis ad aliquem transferri*: all the other canons are confined to the trafficking in presentations and preventing the granting of leases and pensions by incumbents. One definition of simony by a canonist is, *Studiosa voluntas emendi vel vendendi aliquod spirituale vel spirituali annexum*. This definition can by no construction be extended to special bonds of resignation made to enable a patron to provide for his relation or friend. Another writer has defined simony to be *Spiritualium acceptio vel donatio non gratuita*. This word *gratuita* is used as an opposite to *oneraria*, and only applies to a corrupt bargain for money or other direct property. In exchanges each party proposes to himself some benefit, the one expects to get more profit, the other a more healthy, or agreeable, or advantageous residence; yet exchanges are expressly allowed by the statute of *Elizabeth*, because exchanges, though productive of temporal advantages to one or both parties, are not the vile corrupt contracts which were intended to be prohibited by the legislature.

But it has been said by one of my learned brothers this is a benefit and profit, because by means of it money will be obtained; for if the judgments of the courts below should be confirmed, the defendant in error will get £10,000. The performance of the condition of all bonds is enforced by pecuniary penalties, and which pecuniary penalties may, in the event of a breach of the condition, be recovered. This is the case when bonds are given for the faithful performance of any office; yet, such bonds have been enforced over and over again, and no such objection was ever made to them. If the intent of the obligee was to obtain the penalty of the bond, and not the resignation of the living, such intent would be corrupt, and the bond made to carry it into execution would be void; that would not be a resignation bond but a money bond, all that was said about resignation being a mere colour to cover the corrupt intent. But this corrupt intent not appearing on the face of the bond, must be pleaded. There is no such plea in the present case, nor is there the least reason

to suspect that the defendant in error ever contemplated so mercenary and so base an object. He expected that the obligor would perform the condition of the bond, and then no money or other corrupt benefit could have been offered.

Is it consistent with justice or common sense that a man is to lose his right, because his opponent compels him, by a breach of his contract, to sue for a penalty which he neither expected nor desired? Mr. Justice *Heath* says, in *Ffytche* and the Bishop of *London*, "The law construes bonds according to the intent of the parties, and in all bonds with a condition the penalty is only considered as enforcing the condition." So, my Lords, although a patron can derive no pecuniary advantage from the presentation to a living; yet if his clerk be not admitted, the law permits him to recover damages in a *quare impedit*. It has been insisted that advowsons are pure trusts, and that patrons, in the execution of these trusts, have no right to consider their families or adopt any means for reserving presentations for any of their children or relations. This opinion is founded on what Lord *Coke* says, that "a guardian in socage does not take a presentation to a living, because he cannot make money of it." This doctrine has led to the ridiculous ceremony of the guardian putting the pen into the hands of an infant in the cradle, and guiding its feeble hand while it signs a presentation. But executors and administrators of lay patrons present to livings that have become vacant in the life times of their testators or intestates. Presentations are not pure spiritual trusts: if they had been so considered, the bishops could never have allowed them to be disposed of by laymen;—advowsons in gross or next presentations could never have been permitted to be sold;—archbishops could not leave option to their widows or other lay persons. The learned *Selden* calls the right of lay patrons to present to church livings, "the interest of patronage which the lay founders challenged in their new erected churches." Lord *Kenyon* calls a right of presentation "a trust connected with an interest." The founders of lay patronage when they endowed the churches reserved the right of patronage and the right of taking resignation bonds in favour of their children and descendants. The bishops, by allowing the dedication of tithes to be made on these conditions, obtained a provision for many churches that would otherwise have remained without endowment. As the bishops were to decide on the fitness of the persons to be presented, they wisely thought that the allowing patrons the privilege of taking such bonds could not injure the church. On the contrary, from the exercise of this privilege the younger members of the families of great land-owners were brought into the church, and a connexion has been kept up between the landed interest and the church, which greatly contributes to increase the security and influence of the latter; at the same time the members of great families are generally better educated, and from those family connexions likely to be more respected in their parishes, than any other clergymen that can be found. The practice of taking special resignation bonds, and the sanction that such bonds have uniformly received from the courts of Westminster, are the highest evidence that such bonds were allowed by the original compact made

between lords of manors and the bishops, when churches were founded. These were some of the interests which *Selden* says the patrons challenged in their new erected churches. It has been said that a clerk, who has given one of these bonds, cannot subscribe the proper form of resignation, or take the oath administered on his institution. The unhappy men who have taken this oath, and resigned in consequence of bonds of resignation, have been charged with perjury. This, my Lords, is a dreadful charge against the thousands of worthy persons who have given such bonds, and honourably performed the conditions of them. The objection as to the form of resignation assumes, that the words *sponte, pure et simpliciter* are an essential part of the instrument of resignation. There is no particular settled form of words necessary in a resignation. Neither these words, nor any thing of the like import, are in the form of resignation given by *Degge*.

But if a resignation in this precise form were required, the only import of the words *sponte, pure et simpliciter*, is that the clerk was not driven by unlawful violence or threats, or seduced by any corrupt agreement, to make the resignation; but that he made it willingly and because he thought it his duty to make it. With regard to the oath, I admit that, by Archbishop Courtney's decree, persons presented are required to swear that "*obligati non sunt nec eorum amici pro se juratoria aut pecuniaria cautione de ipsis beneficiis resignandis.*" These words are not in the oath prescribed by the Council of Westminster, 1138, or that of the Council of Oxford, 1236; the insertion of them by the Archbishop into the oath required by his decree shows that he and those who advised him thought that the oaths previously taken did not reach resignation bonds. The archbishop had no authority to alter the oath, and if any bishop was now to refuse to admit a clerk who declined taking this oath, he would render himself liable to damages and the costs of a *quare impedit*. By altering oaths of office, you may alter the condition, duties and responsibilities of the officers. Parliament only can do this, in civil offices; and councils of the clergy, with the approbation of the king, in ecclesiastical. Lord Coke says, "a new oath cannot be imposed without the authority of parliament." In 1603, a canon was made prescribing a form of oath to be taken by persons presented to benefices, and this canon was confirmed by the king. The clergy who assisted at the convocation which made the canon must have known of Archbishop Courtney's decree, and yet they have omitted in the form of oath the words relative to bonds of resignation. How is this omission to be accounted for? why, either the clergy or those who advised the crown thought that bonds of resignation if not abused were legal and proper, and therefore they would not allow any oath to be administered to clerks which should prevent them from giving such bonds.

I have heard it said, why will not patrons rely on the honour of clergymen? My Lords, if the clergy cannot give bonds, they cannot pledge their honour. If the one is a violation of their duty inconsistent with the forms of resignation and their oaths, so is the other. The last objection to the validity of these bonds is, that they convert an estate for the life of the incumbent into an estate determinable on a particular

event during the life of the incumbent. Supposing that the clergyman's interests in his benefice be exactly the same as that of a lay tenant for life, there is nothing in the objection; for the condition to resign in the case of a benefice, forms no part of the instrument that creates the interest in it: it is made by a separate deed. Now, my Lords, if a tenant for life were to give a bond to convey back his estate on the happening of a particular event, such a bond would not be voidable in law.

The objection is, to introducing into the instrument conferring the estate, a condition that is inconsistent with it; as when a deed conveys to B. an absolute indefeasible estate for his life, and contains a proviso on a certain event, that estate shall determine in the life-time of the party to whom it is given: your Lordships will perceive there is more of technicality than reason in this distinction. But no two estates are less like each other than that of a clerk in his benefice, and a lay tenant for life; they are created with different objects, conditions are annexed to one which are not annexed to the other; the clergyman, to preserve his estate, must perform the duties of his church. If he takes another benefice, without a dispensation, he vacates the first. These conditions are by the original compact between the leaders of the church and the clergy that I have already referred to.

My Lords, I humbly hope that I have proved, that the judgment of this House in the Bishop of *London v. Ffytche* does not bear upon the question now to be decided by your Lordships, that no principle can, by any just legal reasoning, be deduced from that case that is applicable to this. That securing a benefit for a brother or friend, is not a *profit or benefit* within the meaning of the statute of Eliz. That these general terms must, according to the true and established rules for construing penal statutes, be restrained by the particular words that precede them, and holden to mean any benefits of the same sorts as those particularly specified. That the taking of these bonds is not an abuse of the right of patronage, as that right stands according to the common law; and that they are not inconsistent with the estate which incumbents have in their benefices. That these bonds appear to have been used from the earliest times both by ecclesiastical and lay patrons, and have been uniformly supported by the judgments of the Courts of Westminster. That the consequences of declaring these bonds void, will not be confined to the injury done to the long established rights of patrons. It will be in a laxity in the mode of construing penal statutes that will deprive persons accused of crimes of the benefit of that humane rule, which secures from punishment all whose offences are not clearly within the letter as well as the spirit of the law. The judgments of the Courts of Westminster Hall are the only authority that we have for by far the greatest part of the law of England. The overturning the long series of judgments which declares the validity of these bonds, must introduce uncertainty and confusion into every branch of the common law. Can it be said, that the law which governs these bonds is unjust? No, my Lords, the injustice is in destroying, without compensation, a vested right. Can it be said, that they are inconsistent with the policy of our laws? That policy encourages us to provide for our children, relations, and friends,

and allows us to bestow on them offices for which they are duly qualified. In ecclesiastical benefices the public have a security for the fitness of the person presented, which does not exist in other cases. The bishops are to take care, that neither friendship, nor natural affection, puts a clerk into a church who is not duly qualified to do the duties of it. If a patron may give a living to his son, or relation, or friend, what objection is there, if it becomes vacant when the person for whom it is intended is incapable of taking it, to his permitting some other person to hold it until the incapacity of the first object of his choice be removed? It has been said this can be done in the case of no other office. There are no other offices that have been created by the patrons, and endowed out of their estates, and, therefore, there could be no legal origin for the right to take such bonds in any other offices. With respect to other offices, there are no judicial authorities to support such a right. Your Lordships will not suppose, that, by holding these bonds to be void, you will make patrons forget their faculties, and look out, unbiassed by affection or friendship, for the most worthy clergyman to fill the vacant benefice. Many of them will act, as some patrons have done, where a living, the presentation to which they are desirous of selling, becomes void before it is sold, that they will present some old man, By which are the duties of an incumbent likely to be best performed—a young man in full health, under a bond of resignation, or an old man, who has just enough of life left not to be liable to be objected to by a bishop on account of his imbecility?

Many owners of manors, with advowsons annexed, will sell the advowsons from the manors. Those who pay large sums of money to purchase advowsons in gross, will not be the most likely persons to hold such advowsons as pure trusts, and in disposing of them look only to the maxim *detur digniori*; such alienations of the church patronage will break the connexion between the landed interest and the clergy. The young men of family are, from their education and habits, likely to make the best parish priests; from their connexion with the owners of the lands in the parishes, all the inhabitants feel a respect for them, which must add much to the effect of the instruction they give. Connexion with proprietors of the soil gives to the clergyman the greatest interest in the happiness of his parishioners, and stimulates him to promote their spiritual welfare. Such persons will not take orders where the livings, which their ancestors founded, are severed from their families. I am aware these are rather considerations of policy than law. But, my Lords, if there be any doubts what is the law, judges solve such doubts by considering what will be the good or bad effects of their decision. I say nearly in the words of one of the bishops, in the *Bishop of London v. Ffytche*, that doctrine cannot be law which injures the rights of individuals, and will be productive of evil to the church and to the community.

Lord Chief Justice Abbott.—My Lords, the question appears to me to consist of two parts:—First, whether enough appears on the record to show that the bond was given as the price or consideration of the pre-

sentation to the benefice?—Secondly, supposing this to appear, then, whether the bond is void by the statute or common law.

As to the first part of the question, I am of opinion, that enough does appear upon the face of the record to show, that the bond was given as the price or consideration of the presentation to the benefice. If the fact be manifest upon the face of the instrument, it is not necessary to aver it in order to bring it to the notice of the Court, or within the meaning of the statute, and that the fact does so appear it is only necessary to advert to the language of the condition.

In this case, my Lords, the statute mentions the act alone, without any epithet or qualification. The section commences with this preamble: "For the avoiding of simony and corruption in presentation, collations, and donations, of and to benefices, dignities, prebends, and other livings and promotions ecclesiastical, and in admissions, institutions and inductions to the same, be it enacted, That if any person shall or do at any time," after such a period, "for any sum of money, reward, gift, profit or benefit, directly or indirectly, or for or by reason of any promise, agreement, &c. of or for any sum of money, reward, gift, profit or benefit whatsoever, directly or indirectly, present or collate any person, &c. to any benefice, that then such presentation be utterly void:" it is to that section to which I would beg to call your Lordships' attention, from which it appears that the mere taking of any gift, profit or benefit, is in itself an avoidance of the presentation. It is necessary, with respect to any question that may arise upon the statute of *Elizabeth*, or any question that may arise on the common law, to see what the fact is, the question being, whether it is apparent upon the face of the instrument that the bond is given as the price of the presentation? It seems to me impossible for any person to read the condition of this bond, as it appears upon the record, without taking it that it was given as the price of the presentation, and that the presentation was given as the consideration of the bond.

It begins with reciting, that *Lewis Richard*, Lord *Sondes*, is the patron of the rectory, which rectory had become vacant by the death of the late incumbent. The next recital is, "That my Lord *Sondes*, by writing under his hand and seal bearing equal date with the above-written obligation, presented the above bounden *Brice William Fletcher* to supply the vacancy;" from which it appears, that the presentation and bond are connected together; and then it goes on, "And whereas the said *Brice William Fletcher* has agreed to resign the said rectory into the hands of the proper ordinary, upon such request or notice as hereinafter mentioned, so as that the said rectory may thereby again become vacant:" Can any person read this and not conclude that the presentation and the bond were concurrent acts?—that they were founded upon a prior agreement to resign? This was undoubtedly the opinion of Lord *Mansfield* in the *Bishop of London v. Ffytche*. That being so, my Lords, for the reasons which I have just given to your Lordships, I am of opinion that there is enough upon the face of the record to show that this bond was given as the price of the presentation.

Then, my Lords, the second inquiry which arises is, whether such a bond, given as the price or consideration of the presentation, is void in law? Upon this question I conceive the true inquiry to be only, whether this bond is within the rule and principle of the decision in the case of the Bishop of *London v. Ffytche*? I conceive, my Lords, that case to have established a rule and principle binding upon all jurisdictions except that of your Lordships' House. It is true that the question there arose directly upon the presentation, and not upon the bond; but it is treated throughout as being one and the same: as the presentation and the bond are the price and consideration of each other, it seems impossible to say that the one can be good and valid and the other bad and void.

That case, my Lords, arose upon a presentation, accompanied by a bond to resign upon the request of the patron; it was what is called a "general resignation bond." The present case arises upon a presentation accompanied by a bond to resign upon request, whereby and so as that the patron may be enabled to present one of his two brothers, in the condition named, when such of them as is to be presented shall be capable of taking an ecclesiastical benefice; the agreement having been, that the presentee shall so resign, to the intent that the patron may present one of those two persons. This therefore, my Lords, is one of those that have been called "special resignation bonds."

I consider, my Lords, the bond now in question to differ from the general bond in degree only, and not in principle or kind. If it be a benefit to a patron to be able to call for a resignation whenever he may choose to present any other person, it must in my opinion be a benefit, though perhaps a less benefit, to be able to command a resignation in order to present a relation or friend; and if there be any benefit, the degree of benefit must be immaterial, and the case will be within the statute. And if the law will not allow a benefice to be held absolutely at the will of the patron, and voidable whenever he may choose to present any other person, in my opinion the law cannot allow a benefice to be so held as to be voidable when a relation or friend of the patron may be capable of taking it and the patron may think fit to present him; for in each case the estate or interest of the incumbent will be less than a freehold, whereas a benefice is spoken of as a freehold in all our books, whatever it may have been in its origin or first constitution, all traces of which are now lost in the obscurity of antiquity.

But, further, it is not only required that a benefice shall be freely given and freely taken, but if resigned, it must be freely and voluntarily resigned; *non metu coactus sed spontanea voluntate*; and how can a resignation be voluntary which is made in order to avoid the penalty of a bond, whether a patron has a right to impose the penalty at his pleasure or only for a particular purpose? And ought the law to sanction an instrument that places a clergyman in a situation either to subject himself to a demand which he may be unable to pay, or to make a solemn declaration contrary to his conscience and to truth? In my opinion the law ought not to permit this.

Again, my Lords; the bond in question enables the patron to com-

mand a resignation in favour of one of his two brothers. If such a bond should be held valid, where is the line to be drawn, or what limit is to be fixed? If it be good in favour of brothers, why may it not also be good in favour of cousins or more remote kindred, or of friends? If it be allowed in favour of two persons, why may it not be allowed in favour of more than two—of twelve, of twenty, or even of a greater number? I am unable to discover any rule or principle upon which it may be said, “thus far shalt thou go, but no farther;” and I infer, therefore, that no step must be taken towards the accomplishment of an object which may reserve any benefit of this nature to the patron, or make the interest of the incumbent less than that freehold or estate for life, to be forfeited only for misconduct or by a regular judicial proceeding, which the law supposes him to possess and requires that he shall be permitted to enjoy.

For these reasons, my Lords, I am of opinion that enough appears upon the face of this bond to show that it is void and illegal.

We are compelled by want of room to omit the opinions given by the rest of the judges upon this important question. But it may be interesting to our readers to know, that the Lord Chief Baron, Mr. Justice Park, and Barons Graham and Garrow, pronounced the bond invalid, and that Mr. Justice Burrough pronounced it valid. The remaining judges did not deliver their opinions.

On the motion of the Lord Chancellor, the decision of the House was postponed till the present session.

STATE OF THE DIOCESES

IN

ENGLAND AND WALES,

FROM JANUARY TO MARCH, INCLUSIVE.

CANTERBURY.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. Edward Nares, D.D. Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford, and Rector of Biddenden, Kent, to hold the Rectory and Vicarage of Newchurch, Kent, by Dispensation under the Great-Seal; Patron, the Archbishop of Canterbury.

The Hon. and Rev. George Pellew, M.A. of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and Prebendary of Canterbury, to the Rectory of St. George, with St. Mary Magdalen, Canterbury; Patrons, the Dean and Chapter of that Cathedral.

The Rev. William Pitman Jones, Curate of St. Andrew, and St. Mary Bredman, and Second Master of the King's School, Canterbury, to the Rectory of Eastbridge, Kent; Patron, the Archbishop.

YORK.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. Charles Musgrave, M.A. Vicar of Whitkirk, and Perpetual Curate of Roundhay, Yorkshire, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, to the Vicarage of Halifax, Yorkshire; Patron, the King.

The Rev. Mr. Croft, of Stillington, near York, to the Vicarage of Hutton Bushel, near Scarborough; Patron, E. Fitzwilliam.

The Rev. O. L. Collins, to the Perpetual Curacy of Osset; Patron, the Rev. J. Buckworth, M.A.

The Rev. Dr. French, Master of Jesus College, Cambridge, to the Rectory of Moor Monkton, near York; Patron, the Lord Chancellor.

The Rev. William Airey, M.A. of Queen's College, Oxford, to the Perpetual Curacy of Hexham, Northumberland; Patrons, Colonel and Mrs. Beaumont.

MARRIED.

The Rev. H. Torre, Rector of Thornhill, to Sarah Caroline, eldest daughter of Sir John Lister Kaye, Bart. of Deuby Grange, Yorkshire.

The Rev. W. Tyler, of Keighley, Yorkshire, to Miss Dawes, of Mount Vernon, near Barnsley, in that county.

The Rev. J. Swindell, to Miss Cecilia Branton, third daughter of the late T. Sparkes, Esq. both of Aldborough.

The Rev. Joseph Jaques, of Cawthorne, to Ellen, second daughter of Mr. Carter, of Yew Cottage, near the former place.

The Rev. Thomas Richardson, of Bishophill, to Miss Mary Grainger, of the city of York.

DECEASED.

The Rev. John Heselton, Minister of the New Chapel, Morley, Yorkshire.

In his 80th year, the Rev. Joseph Bowman, upwards of 50 years Curate of Slaiddburn, Yorkshire.

Aged 68, the Rev. Samuel Knight, M.A. Vicar of Halifax.—He was formerly Fellow of Magdalen College, Cambridge, and was nominated in 1798, the first Incumbent of the Holy Trinity Church, in Halifax, which he held till his appointment to the Vicarage on the decease of the Rev. Henry W. Coulthurst, D.D. in the year 1817.

The Rev. T. Balmforth, of Holmfirth, near Huddersfield, aged 66.

Aged 84, the Rev. James Rudd, D.D. Rector of Full Sutton, Yorkshire.

At Moreby, near York, the Rev. Tho. Preston.—He was an active Magistrate for the East Riding of York.

At Settle, the Rev. William Peart, only surviving son of John Peart, Esq.

Aged 30, the Rev. George Dales, of York.

The Rev. John Blanchard, Rector of Middleton, near Beverly, Yorkshire.

The Rev. M. Ogden, Perpetual Curate of Sowerby, near Halifax.

LONDON.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. Robert Firmin, B.A. of Clare Hall, Cambridge, to the Vicarage of Fingringhoe, Essex; Patron, his Father.

The Rev. Carew Anthony St. John Mildmay, M.A. of Oriel College, Oxford, to the Rectory of Chelmsford.

The Rev. Lord Frederick Beauclerk, M.A. of Trinity College, Cambridge, to the Vicarage of St. Michael, St. Albans.

ORDAINED.

March 11.

By the Lord Bishop.

DEACONS.

Richard Foster, B.A. St. John's College. Egerton Anthony Brydges, B.A. Trinity College.

MARRIED.

The Rev. William Winthrop, Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, to Frances Mary, eldest daughter of the Rev. G. Feachem, Vicar of Dorking.

The Rev. Daniel Williams, B.D. Afternoon Lecturer of St. Bartholomew the Great, Smithfield, to Martha Blyth, eldest daughter of the late Rev. T. A. Dale, of Lewes, Sussex.

The Rev. Edward Osborn, M.A. of St. Peter's College, Cambridge, to Mary, second daughter of the late Henry Bolland, Esq.

The Rev. Richard W. Allix, B.D. Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and Rector of Great Warley, Essex, to Jane, relict of the late Rev. George White, LL. B.

The Rev. R. Watkinson, late Second Master of the Charter House, to Miss Harby, of Caroline-place, Mecklenburgh-square.

The Rev. John Adeney, of Essex, to

Kitty Mary Jane, youngest daughter of the late Sir Thomas Carr, of Beddingham, Sussex.

The Rev. George Hogdson Thompson, M.A. to Georgiana, daughter of William Hobson, Esq. of Markfield, Stamford Hill.

At St. James's, Clerkenwell, by the Rev. D. Rewell, M.A. the Rev. G. S. Faight, to Anne, youngest daughter of Frederick Le Clerc, Esq. Cummin-street.

DECEASED.

The Rev. Charles Frederick Bond, M.A. Vicar of Margaretting, Essex, aged 62.

At Hampstead, the Rev. William Gilbank, in his 39th year.

The Rev. James Carpenter Gape, one of his Majesty's Chaplains in Ordinary, Rector of Croydon-cum-Clopton, Cambridgeshire, and Vicar of St. Michael's, St. Alban's, in the 73d year of his age.

The Rev. R. Johnson, aged 72, Rector of the Parishes of St. Antholin's and St. John Baptist.

DURHAM.

PREFERRED.

The Hon. and Rev. Dr. Wellesley, one of the Canons Residentiary of St. Paul's, to the Living of Bishop Wearmouth.

MARRIED.

The Rev. Henry Gunning, second son of the late Sir George Gunning, Bart. of Horton, Northamptonshire, to Mary Catharine, daughter of W. R. Cartwright, Esq. M.P.

DECEASED.

The Rev. Dr. Charles Henry Hall, Dean of Durham, on Friday, March 16, (owing to a violent accession of Fever, of no long duration,) at Edinburgh, whither he had gone with a view of consulting physicians, accompanied by his family.

Dr. Hall was elected a Westminster Student of Christ Church, Oxford, in 1779. In 1781 he was a successful Candidate for the Chancellor's Latin Verse Prize, "*Strages Indica Occidentalis*," and in 1784 he gained another Chancellor's Prize, the English Essay on "*The Use of Medals*." In 1793 he served the Office of Proctor, with Mr. Cartwright, of All Soul's College; in 1798 he preached the Bampton Lectures. In 1799 Dr. Hall succeeded Dr. Shafto as Canon of Christ Church; in 1807, on the promotion of Dr. Randolph to the Bishopric of London, he

was appointed Regius Professor of Divinity; and on the resignation of Dr. Jackson in 1809, he succeeded to the Deanery of Christ Church, which he resigned in 1824, when appointed Dean of Durham. He took the Degree of M.A. in January, 1786; B.D. 1794; and D.D. in 1800. He was in the 65th year of his age.—By the death of Dr. Hall, the Vicarage of Luton, in Bedfordshire, becomes vacant; Patron, the Marquis of Bute.

Dr. Hall married Anna Maria, the daughter of the late Lord Torrington, and sister of the present Viscount, in 1794, by whom he had several children, six of whom are living.

The Rev. Wm. Mack, Perpetual Curate of Egglestone, aged 77.

WINCHESTER.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. F. Swanton, to the Vicarage of Piddletrenthide, Dorset; Patrons, the Dean and Chapter of Winchester.

The Rev. Francis Swanton, to the Perpetual Curacy of St. John's Church, Winchester.

The Rev. J. B. Atkinson, M.A. to the Perpetual Curacy of West Cowes, in the Isle of Wight; Patron, the Rev. J. Breeks, Vicar of Carisbrooke, in right of his Vicarage.

MARRIED.

The Rev. W. R. Bewsher, of Richmond, to Margaret, second daughter of the late E. Hawthorn, Esq.

The Rev. Henry Vallance, M.A. to Charlotte Channing, daughter of the late Rev. William Jarvis Abdy, M.A. Rector of St. John's, Southwark.

The Rev. James Duff Ward, M.A. of Trinity College, Oxford, fifth son of George Ward, Esq. of Northwood Park, Isle of Wight, to Harriet Marcia, eldest daughter of Henry Seymour, Esq. of Hanford.

The Rev. Francis Swanton, of Winchester, to Mary, only daughter of the late Rev. J. Brereton.

DECEASED.

Aged 75, the Rev. David Middleton, Rector of Crux Easton, Hants.

At Yarmouth, the Rev. Starling Kelty, M.A. one of the Senior Fellows of King's College, Cambridge.

At Haslemere, Surrey, the Rev. James Parson.

NO. II.—APR. 1827.

BANGOR.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. Thomas Morgan, D.D. Chaplain of his Majesty's Dock Yard at Portsmouth, to the Vicarage of Llansadwra, with Llanwrda Chapel, in the County of Carnarvon; Patron, Admiral Sir Thomas Foley.

ORDAINED.

At a special ordination held at the cathedral, on Thursday, the 25th January, by the Lord Bishop.

DEACONS.

Peter Maurice, B.A. Jesus College Oxford.

PRIESTS.

Henry Weir White, B.A. Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford.

Hugh Lloyd, B.A. Jesus College Oxford.

Hugh Wynne Jones, B.A. Jesus College, Cambridge.

William Price, B.A. Queen's College, Cambridge.

BATH AND WELLS.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. Loftus Anthony Cliffe, B.A. to the Vicarage of Sampford-Arundell, Somersetshire; Patron, W. Bellett, Esq.

The Rev. Henry Law, M.A. late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, to the Chancellorship of the Diocese of Bath and Wells; Patron, his father.

The Rev. Charles Edmund Keene, to the Prebendal Stall of Wiveliscombe, in the Cathedral Church; Patron, the Lord Bishop.

MARRIED.

The Rev. W. H. Gardiner, of Barustaple, to Mrs. Long.

The Rev. T. F. Newman, of Frome, Somersetshire, to Miss S. Bedford, Pen-sham, Worcestershire.

The Rev. J. C. J. Hoskyns Abrahall, M.A. Scholar of Wadham College, Oxford, and Master of Bruton Free Grammar School, to Jane, third daughter of Edward Dyne, Esq. solicitor, Bruton.

The Rev. Charles Ranken, M.A. Student of Christ Church, Oxford, to Isabella, daughter of Edward Long Fox, M.D. of Brislington House.

DECEASED.

Aged 67, the Rev. Elias Taylor, B.D. of Trinity College, Oxford, and of Shoss-

N N

wick House, in the county of Somerset, and one of his Majesty's Justices of the Peace for that county.

BRISTOL.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. ROBERT GRAY, D.D. Prebendary of Durham, and Rector of Bishop Wearmouth, to be LORD BISHOP of this Diocese.

CHESTER.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. Charles Dodgson, M.A. Student of Christ Church, Oxford, to the augmented Curacy of Daresbury, in this Diocese; Patron, the Dean and Chapter of Christ Church.

The Rev. Thomas Lloyd Payne, M.A. of Brasenose College, Oxford, is appointed to the Curacy of St. Thomas's, Liverpool; Patron, the Lord Bishop.

The Rev. W. Scoresby, F.R.S.L. and E.M.W.S. &c. Curate of Besingby and Carnaby, Yorkshire, to the Chaplaincy of the Mariner's Church at Liverpool.

The Rev. William Ainger, D.D. Superintendent of the Clerical Institution of St. Bees, Cumberland, to a Prebend in the Cathedral Church.

The Rev. J. Headlam, M.A. Rector of Wycliffe, Yorkshire, to be Archdeacon of Richmond.

MARRIED.

The Rev. William Lockett, Curate of Davenham, to Mary, eldest daughter of the late R. L. Dudley, Esq. of Windsor Lodge, Cheshire.

The Rev. Charles Mytton, Rector of Eccleston, to Elizabeth, daughter of the late Hon. Booth Grey.

The Rev. Bertie Johnson, Rector of Lymme, Cheshire, to Isabel, second daughter of the late John Legh, Esq. of Booth's Hall, in the same county.

At the church of the Holy Trinity, Chester, by the Lord Bishop, the Rev. George Becher Blomfield, Rector of Tattenhall, in that county, to Frances Maria, third daughter of the Rev. R. Massie, of Stanley Place, Chester.

DECEASED.

At Liverpool, aged 78, the Rev. James Page, formerly Curate of St. Peter's and St. Paul's, Bath.

The Rev. Thomas Trevor Trevor, D.C.L. of Christ Church, Oxford, and a Prebendary of Chester. He took his Degree of B. and D.C.L. in 1816.

At Horrock Hall, Lancashire, the Rev. Rigbye Rigbye, in his 77th year.

CHICHESTER.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. W. Wallinger, M.A. of University College, Oxford, to the Vicarage of Hellingly, Sussex; Patron, the Earl of Chichester.

The Rev. Hugh James Rose, M.A. Vicar of Horsham, Sussex, to a Prebendal Stall in the Cathedral Church; Patron, the Lord Bishop.

The Rev. Thomas Baker, M.A. Christ College, Cambridge, to hold by Dispensation the Vicarage of Bexhill, with the Rectory of Bodmill, both in Sussex: Patron, the Lord Bishop.

The Rev. Mr. Elliott, of Trinity College, Cambridge, appointed to the New Chapel of St. Mary's, Brighton.

The Rev. Thomas Agar Holland, B.A. of Worcester College, Oxford, to the Vicarage of Oving, Sussex; Patron, the Precentor of Chichester.

ST. DAVID'S.

MARRIED.

The Rev. Augustus Brigstocke, of Blaenpenna, Cardiganshire, M.A. and Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford, to Jane Ann Bridget, eldest daughter of D. Davies, Esq. M.D. of Pentre, Pembrokeshire.

The Rev. John Noble Coleman, M.A. late of Queen's College, Oxford, to Margaretta Eleonora Marella, youngest daughter of the late Rev. Daniel Evans, Rector of Llanvernach, Pembrokeshire.

The Rev. Amos Crymer, of Thornton, Pembrokeshire, to Miss Falconer, of Havverfordwest.

DECEASED.

At Cardiff, after a long and painful illness, the Rev. Archer John Langley, M.A. Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford.

ELY.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. John Griffith, B.D. Curate of the Parish of St. Mary, in Ely, and late Fellow of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, to the Vicarage of Fulbourn, All Saints.

MARRIED.

The Rev. H. Smith, M.A. Fellow of St. Peter's College, Cambridge, to Miss Morris, of Nottingham.

DECEASED.

At Newton, near Wisbeach, the Rev. William Mair, aged 51, Vicar of Fulbourn, All Saints, Cambridgeshire.

EXETER.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. Samuel Rowe, B.A. of Jesus College, Cambridge, to the perpetual Curacy of St. Budeaux, near Plymouth; Patron, the Rev. John Hatchard, M.A. Vicar of St. Andrew's, Plymouth.

The Rev. William Swete, late of Oriel College, Oxford, to the Rectory of St. Leonard, Devon.

The Rev. Peter Glubb, Rector of Little Torrington, to the Living of Clandborough, in the County of Devon; Patron, the Lord Chancellor.

MARRIED.

At Bishop's Teignton, Devon, the Rev. John Wrey, of Oakhampton, to Ann Burnet, only daughter of the late Rev. Joseph Lane Yeomans, M.A. Vicar of Bishop's Teignton and Braunton, Devonshire.

DECEASED.

The Rev. W. Mitchell, rector of Corleigh and Barwick, Devon.

At Great Torrington, in his 75th year, the Rev. John Palmer, Prebendary of Lincoln, Rector of Clannaborough, Devon, and of South Benflete, Essex.

At Sidmouth, aged 24, the Rev. A. Blanchard, B.A. son of the Rev. J. Blanchard, Rector of Middleton, Yorkshire.

GLOUCESTER.

MARRIED.

The Rev. R. B. Holmes, of Gloucester, to Margaret, fourth daughter of the late S. Lassage, Esq. of Leeds.

DECEASED.

Aged 72, the Rev. Matthew Surtees, M.A. late Fellow of University College, Oxfordshire, and Rector of North Cerney, Gloucestershire, which Living is in the patronage of that Society. At the time of his death Mr. Surtees was Rector of Kirkby Underdale, Yorkshire, and Prebendary of Canterbury. He took the Degree of M.A. in 1780.

HEREFORD.

MARRIED.

At Hereford, the Rev. Allan Whitmore Lechmere, B.A. of Pembroke College, Oxford, to Maria Anne, only daughter of the late Thomas Cotes, Esq. M.D. of Abbey Dore.

DECEASED.

At Hereford, aged 32, the Rev. Henry Morse, eldest son of the late Mr. G. Morse, of Lidbrook.

At Landinabo, Herefordshire, in his 84th year, the Rev. J. Hoskins, Rector of that Parish, and Lecturer of Uxbridge.

LICHFIELD AND COVENTRY.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. William Edward Coldwell, M.A. Rector of St. Mary's, Stafford, to the Vicarage of Sandon, Staffordshire; Patron, the Earl of Harrowby.

The Rev. Mr. Franklin, Chief Grammar Master of Christ's Hospital, at Hertford, has been presented by the Governors to the Vicarage of Albrighton, in Shropshire.

The Rev. W. Vaughan, M.A. of Shrewsbury, and of St. John's College, Cambridge, to the Perpetual Curacy of Astley; Patrons, the Corporation of Shrewsbury.

ORDAINED.

By the Lord Bishop, in Wells Cathedral, on Sunday.

January 27th.

DEACONS.

Philip Arden Cooper, B.A. Oriel College, Oxford.

James Jackson, B.A. Brasenose College, Oxford.

Henry Dudley Ryder, B.A. Oriel College, Oxford.

George Arthur Smyth, B.A. St. Edmund Hall, Oxford.

Summerton Tudor, B.A. St. Edmund Hall, Oxford.

George Best Brown, B.A. Clare Hall, Cambridge.

Henry Arthur Herbert, B.A. Trinity College, Dublin.

James Lee, B.A. Trinity College, Dublin.

PRIESTS.

Samuel Fox, B.A. Pembroke College, Oxford.

Edward Power, Student of Magdalen Hall, Oxford.

James Thomas Campbell, B.A. Queen's College, Cambridge.

Samuel Broomhead Ward, B.A. Caius College, Cambridge.

February 11.

DEACONS.

John Kempthorne, B.A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

Francis Owen, B.A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

MARRIED.

The Rev. Charles Williams, of Uffensline, to Miss Pyne, of Wellington.

The Rev. Thomas Browne, Vicar of Tideswell, Derbyshire, to Jane, third daughter of the late Mr. Ollier, surgeon, of Manchester.

The Rev. Duncomb Steele Perkins, B.A. of Trinity College, Oxford, eldest son of Shirley Farmer Steele Perkins, Esq. of Sutton Coldfield, Warwickshire, to Ann, eldest daughter of Josiah Gist, Esq. of Wormington Grange, Gloucestershire.

The Rev. S. Connor, of Ockbrook, Derbyshire, to Sarah, second daughter of Mr. Ferris, Oxford.

DECEASED.

The Rev. George Bonney, 35 years Vicar of Sandon, Staffordshire.

Aged 70, the Rev. Thomas Lloyd, Vicar of Albrighton, Salop.

At Ashborne, the Rev. George Buckston, aged 74.

At Birmingham, in his 77th year, the Rev. J. Holden.

LLANDAFF.

MARRIED.

At Tiddenham, Gloucestershire, the Rev. James Davis, M.A. Vicar of Chipstow, to Henrietta Eliza, only daughter of the late Thomas Vores, of Welbeck-street, London.

LINCOLN.

PREFERRED.

The Right Rev. JOHN KAYE, D.D. LORD BISHOP of Bristol, Master of Christ College, and Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, to be LORD BISHOP of this Diocese.

The Rev. Robert Burnaby, B.A. to the New Church of St. George, Leicester.

The Rev. Robert Tweddell, M.A. to the Vicarage of Liddington with Caldecot, in Rutland.

The Rev. Mr. Lonsdale, Chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury, to the Fellowship of Eton College, vacant by the death of the Rev. Dr. Foster Pigott.

The Rev. William Balfour Winning, M.A. of Trinity College, Cambridge, to the Vicarage of Keyshoe, Bedfordshire; Patrons, the Master and Fellows of that Society.

ORDAINED.

On Sunday, March 11, in Christ College Chapel, Cambridge, by the Lord Bishop.

DEACONS.

George William Brooks, B.A. Christ Church, Oxford.

William May Ellis, B.A. Christ Church, Oxford.

Henry Ven Hodge, B.A. Exeter College, Oxford.

George Davies Kent, M.A. Scholar of Corpus Christi College, Oxford.

George Frederic Apthorp, B.A. Emmanuel College, Cambridge.

John Blissard, B.A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

John Chapman, B.A. Fellow of King's College, Cambridge.

William Grice, Queen's College, Cambridge.

Edward John Shepherd, B.A. Trinity College, Cambridge.

George Thornton, B.A. Trinity College, Cambridge.

John Ferdinando Wilkinson, B.A. Clare Hall, Cambridge.

Alexander Malcolm Wall, M.A. Fellow of St. John's, Cambridge.

John White, Queen's College, Cambridge.

PRIESTS.

Charles Beauchamp Cooper, B.A. University College, Oxford.

Thomas Middleton, B.A. St. Edmund Hall, Oxford.

Thomas Shepherd, B.A. Christ Church, Oxford.

Samuel Adams, B.A. Sydney Sussex College, Cambridge.

Gustavus Andrew Burnaby, B.A. Emmanuel College, Cambridge.

George Ellis, B.A. Catharine Hall, Cambridge.

John Fox, B.A. Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.

William Falcon, B.A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

John Gaitskell, B.A. Sydney Sussex College, Cambridge.

Bernard Gilpin, B.A. Queen's College, Cambridge.

James David Glover, M.A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

William Balfour Winning, M.A. Trinity College, Cambridge.

MARRIED.

The Rev. John Balfour Magen, Vicar

of Sharnbrook and Harold, Beds, to Frances Margaretta Ede, of Merry Oak, Southampton, second daughter of the Hon. Mr. Justice Moore, of Lamberton Park, Ireland.

The Rev. Thomas Pearse, Vicar of Harlington, and of Westoning, Beds, to Anna Letitia, daughter of George Aikin, Esq. of Harlington.

The Rev. W. Gray, of Totteridge, Herts, to Eleanor, youngest daughter of the late William Perry, Esq. of Whitehaven.

The Rev. Isham Case, M.A. Rector of Spingthorpe, Vicar of Merethingham, and Domestic Chaplain to the Duke of St. Alban's, to Catherine, eldest daughter of the Rev. M. Sheath, Rector of Wyberton.

The Rev. John Peacock Bye, of Bengeo, Herts, to Emma, second daughter of Edward Robinson, Esq. of Havering Bower, Essex.

DECEASED.

On the 7th of February, at his Lordship's house, in Connaught-place, in consequence of a severe cold caught by attending the funeral of his Royal Highness the Duke of York, the Hon. and Right Rev. GEORGE PELHAM, Lord Bishop of this Diocese, D.C.L. in the 61st year of his age, after a few days illness. He was the youngest son of the late, and brother to the present Earl of Chichester. He was born on the 13th October, 1766, and married in 1792, Mary, daughter of Sir R. Rycroft. He was consecrated Bishop of Bristol, in the room of Dr. Cornwall, in 1803, translated to Exeter in the room of Dr. Fisher in 1807, and on Dr. Tomline being moved to the see of Winchester in 1820, his Lordship succeeded him in this Bishoprick. His Lordship was also Clerk of the Closet to the King, and Canon Residentiary of Chichester. His Lordship was a Member of the University of Cambridge.

At the Rectory House, Linwood, near Market Rasen, the Rev. Samuel Pyemont, M.A. in his 68th year. He was for 40 years Rector of that Parish.

The Rev. William Williams, Rector of Medbourn-cum-Holt, Leicestershire.

Aged 72, The Rev. Thomas Nelson, Vicar of Owersby, and of Kirkby-cum-Osgodby.

Aged 82, the Rev. William Harrison, M.A. Vicar of Winterton, and of Great Limber, both in Lincolnshire.

The Rev. John Swan, of Brant

Broughton, Vicar of Carlton-le-Moorland, and Sequestrator of Stapleford, aged 75.

At Aylesbury, aged 82, the Rev. W. Stockins.

NORWICH.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. C. R. Ashfield, B.A. to the Rectory of Blackenham, Suffolk; Patrons, the Provost and Fellows of Eton College.

The Rev. James Coyte, M.A. to the Perpetual Curacy of Farnham, Suffolk; Patron, Dudley Long North, Esq.

The Rev. Cremer Cremer, B.A. to the Rectory and Parish Church of Allmerton, with Runton near the Sea annexed, Norfolk; Patron, William Windham, Esq. of Felbrigg Hall, Rear Admiral of the Red; also to the Rectory of Felbrigg with Melton, by the said Admiral Windham.

The Rev. J. Blanchard, Jun. M.A. to the Vicarage of Lound, near Beverley; Patron, his Father, the Rev. J. Blanchard, Rector of Middleton, Yorkshire.

The Rev. Henry Dawson, to the Rectory of Hopton, Suffolk; Patron, the King.

The Rev. N. W. Hallward, M.A. to the Rectory of Milden, Suffolk.

The Rev. J. Hallward, M.A. to hold by Dispensation the Vicarage of Assington, Suffolk, with the Rectory of Easthope, Essex.

The Rev. Isaac Clark, to the Rectory of Dallinghoe, Suffolk; Patron, E. Moor, Esq. of Bealings.

MARRIED.

The Rev. E. J. Senkler, of Docking, Norfolk, to Eleanor Elizabeth, eldest daughter of the late Rev. W. Stevens, of Sedburgh, Yorkshire.

The Rev. Perry Nurse, B.A. Little Bealings, Suffolk, to Charlotte, youngest daughter of the late Rev. W. Prest Smith, formerly Rector of Waxham and Palling, in Norfolk.

The Rev. Edward Paske, Rector of Cretinge, St. Peter, and Battisford, Suffolk, to Helen Amelia, youngest daughter of the late Peter Gurley, Esq. of the island of St. Vincent.

DECEASED.

At Yarmouth, Norfolk, the Rev. J. T. Davies.

At Pickenham Hall, Norfolk, the Rev. Thomas Vere Chute.

At Framlingham, near Norwich, in the 71st year of his age, the Rev. J. Blanks.

At Fakenham, Suffolk, the Rev. Charles J. Smyth, aged 67, Rector of Fakenham, Vicar of Catton, Norfolk, and late one of the Minor Canons of the Cathedral Church of Norwich.

Aged 65, the Rev. Robert Carey Barnard, B.D. Rector of Withersfield, and one of the Magistrates for the county of Suffolk.

OXFORD.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. CHARLES LLOYD, D.D. Canon of Christ Church, and Regius Professor of Divinity in the University, to be LORD BISHOP of this Diocese.

The very Rev. the Dean and Chapter of Christ Church has been pleased to present the Rev. James Lupton, Chaplain, to the Vicarage of Black Bourton, in this county and diocese.

MARRIED.

The Rev. Charles Lee, fourth son of the Rev. T. T. Lee, Vicar of Thame, to Harrietta, eldest daughter of W. Browne, Esq. Waterloo, Northampton.

DECEASED.

On Saturday evening, the 27th January, in his 60th year, the Hon. and Right Rev. EDWARD LEGGE, Lord Bishop of this Diocese, and Warden of All Souls College, Oxford. His Lordship was the seventh son of William, second Earl of Dartmouth. He was educated at Rugby, and from thence became a member of Christ Church. In 1789 he was elected to a Fellowship in All Souls College, where he took the Degree of B.C.L. June 9, 1791; and that of D.C.L. April 6, 1805. Dr. Legge held for several years the Family Living of Lewisham, in Kent, together with the Deanery of Windsor; the former he resigned a few years since; the latter in 1815, when he was raised to this See, upon the demise of Bishop Jackson, and in 1817 he was elected Warden of All Souls.

At Charlbury, aged 82, the Rev. John Cobb, D.D. formerly Fellow of St. John's College, and Vicar of Charlbury in this county, which Living is in the patronage of the above Society. He was admitted Scholar of St. John's on the 25th of June, 1764; took his Degree of M.A. in 1772; B.D. in 1777; and D.D. in 1781. Dr. Cobb was many years a Magistrate for this county.

On Wednesday, the 24th January, at his Lodge, the Rev. Septimus Collinson, D.D. Provost of Queen's College, and Margaret Professor of Divinity in the University, Prebendary of Worcester, and Rector of Dowlish Wake and Dowlish West, Somersetshire, in his 88th year.—He took his Degree of M.A. in 1767; B.D. 1792; and D.D. in 1793. In 1778 he was presented to the Rectories above-mentioned, of which J. Hanning, Esq. is the Patron. In 1796 he succeeded Dr. Fothergill, as Provost of Queen's College, and in 1798 was elected Margaret Professor of Divinity in the room of Dr. Neve, of Merton College. Dr. Collinson was for some years one of the City Lecturers, but resigned in 1795.

Aged 58, the Rev. Nicholas Marshall Hacker, of Eustone, late Rector of Kidlington, in this county, and formerly Rector of Long Marston, in the county of Gloucester, which latter he resigned in the year 1808. He was of Worcester College.

PETERBOROUGH.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. T. S. Hughes, B.D. Christian Advocate, and Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop, to the Prebendal Stall in the Cathedral Church, vacated by the death of the Lord Bishop of Rochester.

ROCHESTER.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. Walker King, M.A. of Oriel College, Oxford, was appointed, by his late father, the Bishop of Rochester, to the Archdeaconry of that Diocese.

The Rev. M. Irving, B.D. to the Perpetual Curacy of Chatham; Patrons, the Dean and Chapter of Rochester.

DECEASED.

February 21.

On Thursday, at his residence at Wells, the Right Rev. Dr. WALKER KING, Lord Bishop of this Diocese, Senior Canon of Wells Cathedral, and Prebendary of Peterborough. Dr. King was of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and took his Degree of M.A. in 1775, and B. and D.D. in 1788. In the year 1808 he succeeded to this Bishopric, on Dr. Dampier's being promoted to that of Ely.

At Rochester, in the 88th year of his age, the Rev. Dr. Law, Archdeacon of Rochester, and Rector of Westmill, Herts, and of Easton Magna, Essex.

SALISBURY.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. W. Roberts, to the Living of Clewer, near Windsor; Patrons, the Provost and Fellows of Eton.

The Rev. Lancelot Miles Halton, B.A. to the Rectory of Woolhampton, in the county of Berks; Patron, the Rev. Lancelot Greenthwait Halton, of Thruxton, Hants, and Harriet his wife.

The Rev. John Edmeads, to the Rectory of St. Mary's, Cricklade, Wilts; Patron, the Lord Bishop.

MARRIED.

The Rev. R. B. Paul, Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford, and Vicar of Long Wittenham, Berks, to Rosa, daughter of the Rev. R. Twopenny, Rector of Little Casterton.

At St. Mary's, Bathwick, the Rev. G. Taunton, B.D. Rector of Stratford St. Anthony, Wilts, and late Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, to Sarah, daughter of James Bradford, Esq. of Swindon.

DECEASED.

The Rev. Henry Hale, M.A. Rector of Orcheston St. Mary, Wilts, and formerly Fellow of Clare Hall, Cambridge. The Rectory is in the Patronage of the Master and Fellows of that Society.

Aged 79, the Rev. William Foster Pigott, D.D. F.A.S. of Abingdon Pigotts, Cambridgeshire, Fellow of Eton College, Rector of Mereworth, Kent, and of Clewer, Berks, and one of his Majesty's Chaplains.

The Rev. Richard Hawkin Hitchins, B.D. Rector of Baverstock, in the county of Wilts, and some time Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. The Living is in the Patronage of that Society. M.A. 1789; B.D. 1799.

The Rev. Alexander Thislethwayte, youngest son of the Rev. Alexander Thislethwayte, of Norman Court, near Salisbury.

WORCESTER.

PREFERRED.

The Hon. and Rev. Thomas Henry Coventry, M.A. to hold with the Rectory of Purton, with Croome d'Abitot annexed, the Rectory of Croome Montis, otherwise Hill Croome, by Dispensation under the

Great Seal; Patron, of the latter preferment, the Lord Chancellor.

The Rev. John Vernon, B. A. to the Rectory of Shrawley, Worcestershire; Patrons, the Executors of the late Thomas Shrawley Vernon, Esq.

The Rev. W. A. Hadow, M.A. to the Rectory of Hasely, in the County of Warwick; Patron, Sir Edmund Antrobus, Bart.

ORDAINED.

By the Lord Bishop, in the Chapel of his Lordship's Castle at Hartlebury.

February 2.

DEACONS.

Matthew Getley, B.A. Lincoln College, Oxford.

Arthur Whalley, B.A. Pembroke College, Oxford.

PRIESTS.

Charles Rodwell Roper, B.A. St. John's College, Oxford.

MARRIED.

The Rev. R. H. Amphlett, of New Hall, near Droitwich, to Jane, daughter of the late T. Dudley, Esq. of Shutt End, Staffordshire.

DECEASED.

In his 39th year, the Rev. Joshua Newby, Rector of Haseley, near Warwick.

In his 51st year, the Rev. H. P. Cooper, Vicar of All Saints' and St. Lawrence, Evesham, Worcestershire, and Perpetual Curate of Hampton, in the same county.

CHAPLAINCIES, &c.

The Lord Bishop of Chichester to be Clerk of the Closet to the King, in the room of the late Bishop of Lincoln.

The Rev. John Hobart Seymour, M.A. of Exeter College, Oxford, and Vicar of Horley-cum-Hornton, in that county, to be Chaplain in Ordinary to the King.

The Rev. Charles Hall, M. A. of Scarbro', Yorkshire, to be one of the Domestic Chaplains to the Right Hon. Lord Macdonald.

The Rev. D. R. Currer, M.A. of Christ Church, Oxford, and of Clifton House, near York, to be one of the Domestic Chaplains to the Right Hon. Lord Viscount Downe.

The Rev. Sir Henry Thompson, Bart. M.A. of Oriel College, Oxford, to be Chaplain to George Collins Poore, Esq. High Sheriff of Hants.

The Rev. R. M. Boulton, B. D. of Merton College, Oxford, to be one of the Domestic Chaplains to the Right Hon. Lord Montagu.

The Rev. Joseph Fletcher, M.A. to be Domestic Chaplain to the Earl of Warwick.

The Rev. H. Parker and Rev. N. R. Dennis, both from the Half-pay, to be Chaplains to the Forces.

The Rev. John Harrison, of Duffield Bank, to be Chaplain to his Royal Highness the Duke of Sussex.

SCHOOLS.

The Rev. John H. Coates Borwell, M. A. of Queen's College, Oxford, is licensed, by the Rev. Precentor Bartlam, to the Free and Endowed Grammar School of Plymouth.

The Rev. Arthur Whalley, B. A. of Pembroke College, Oxford, to the Head Mastership of the Free Grammar School at Kington, in the county of Hereford. Trustees, the Earl of Oxford and Earl Mortimer, the Bishop of Hereford, and Thomas Perry, Esq. of Eardisley Park.

SCOTCH CHURCH.

The King has presented the Rev. P. Buchanan to the Church and Parishes of Stichell and Hume, Presbytery of Kelso, and counties of Berwick and Roxburgh.

The Rev. John McDougal to the Second Charge of the Parish of Cambleton.

The Rev. Julius Wood, M.A. to the Church of Newton-upon-Ayr, vacant by the death of the Rev. Dr. Peebles.

The Rev. David Aitken, to the Parish of Minto: Patron, the Earl of Minto.

MARRIED.

IRELAND.

The Rev. Charles Smith, Prebendary of Howth, to Elizabeth, third daughter of the Archbishop of Dublin.

The Rev. W. Hutchinson, eldest son of T. Hutchinson, Esq. Bury, Lancashire, to Sarah, eldest daughter of Edw. Mitchell, Esq. of Castle Strange, Ireland.

The Rev. Allan Morgan, of New Ross, in the county of Wexford, to Margaret, youngest daughter of the late A. H. Bradley, Esq. of Gore Court, in the county of Kent.

January 1st, at Tipperary Church, the Rev. Benjamin Halford Banner, rector of Bansha, to Helene, widow of the late T. B. Buckworth, Esq.

SCOTLAND.

At Jardine Hall, Dumfries, the Rev. C. S. Hassells, M.A. of Trinity College, to Helen, only daughter of the late Sir Alexander Jardine, Bart. of Applegarth.

The Rev. J. C. Thomson, to Miss M. Johnson, of Berwick.

The Rev. Archibald Nisbett, of Glasgow, to Mrs. Campbell, of Ormaig.

BARBADOS.

At St. George's Church, by the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Barbados, the Rev. Stephen Isaacson, B.A. of Christ College, Cambridge, Rector of St. Paul's, Demarara, to Anna Maria Miller Killikelly, youngest daughter of the late Bryan Bernard Killikelly, Esq. of the island of Barbados.—The Right Hon. the Earl of Huntingdon, his Excellency Sir Benjamin D'Urban, Lady D'Urban and Family, the Venerable the Archdeacon of Barbadoes, &c. &c. honoured the Ceremony by their presence. This being the first instance of a Protestant Bishop having performed any of the Offices of the Church on the vast Continent of South America, its novelty excited a considerable degree of interest, and attracted many persons to the spot.

DECEASED.

In Nottingham, aged 42, the Rev. Tho. Adin, Rector of Charlotte Town, Prince Edward's Island, and Chaplain to His Majesty's Forces on that Station.

In the Island of Madeira, where he had gone for the benefit of his health, the Rev. C. M. Deighton, Vicar of Langhope, Gloucestershire.

IRELAND.

At Cloydagh, Glebe House, near Carlow, the Rev. Dr. Thomas, aged 75, for upwards of 40 years Rector of the Union of Cloydagh, and Prebendary of Shrule, in the Diocese of Leighlin.

In Dublin, Dr. Spray, Vicar Choral of St. Patrick's Cathedral, and formerly a Member of the Cathedral Choir of Lichfield.

SCOTLAND.

The Rev. Dr. Ranken, Minister of St. David's Church, Glasgow.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE UNIVERSITIES. --- --- OXFORD.

DEGREES CONFERRED.—FROM JANUARY TO MARCH, INCLUSIVE.

DOCTORS IN DIVINITY.

March 16.

Rev. John Fox, Provost of Queen's College.

Rev. George Chisholm, Worcester College.

BACHELOR AND DOCTOR IN DIVINITY— (by accumulation.)

February 8.

Rev. John Cookesley, Exeter College.

DOCTOR IN CIVIL LAW.

February 22.

Rev. Geo. Taylor, St. John's College.

BACHELORS IN DIVINITY.

February 1.

Rev. Owen Owen, Fellow of Jesus College.

Rev. James Carne, Oriel College.

February 8.

Rev. Benjamin Saunders Claxon, Worcester College.

Rev. Edwin Prodgers, Trinity College.

March 15.

Rev. John Fox, Provost of Queen's College.

Rev. John William King, Fellow of Corpus Christi College.

Rev. George Chisholm, Worcester College.

March 16.

Rev. Samuel Curlewis Lord, Wadham College.

March 22.

Rev. Henry Shrubbs, Fellow of Corpus College.

BACHELOR IN CIVIL LAW—

(by commutation.)

February 15.

Rev. George Taylor, M.A. St. John's College.

MASTERS OF ARTS.

January 15, being the first day of Lent Term.

Hon. and Rev. Thomas Henry Coventry, Christ Church, grand compounder.

Edmund Frederick Carrington, Queen's College.

William Aislabie Eade, Balliol College.

Donald Maclean, Balliol College.

February 1.

Rev. Richard Mealy, St. John's College, grand compounder.

Rev. Edward Scobell, Magdalen Hall.

William Bentinck Lethem Hawkins, Exeter College.

Rev. Edward Coleridge, Exeter College.

John Prideaux Lightfoot, Fellow of Exeter College.

February 8.

George Davies Kent, Scholar of Corpus Christi College.

Rev. Ernest Hawkins, Balliol College.

Rev. Charles Oakes, St. John's College.

Rev. Thomas Price, Exeter College.

February 15.

Rev. Robert Wynter, Jesus College.

George Henry Woods, Wadham College.

February 22.

Rev. James Daubeny, Brasenose College.

Rev. Joshua Reynolds Johnson, Balliol College.

March 8.

William Bilton, Christ Church, grand compounder.

Rev. Edward Griffith, Exeter College.

Rev. Henry Jones, Exeter College.

Rev. Thomas Byrth, Magdalen Hall.

Rev. Charles Tucker, Wadham College.

March 15.

William John Agg, Pembroke College, grand compounder.

Rev. Maximilian Geneste, Queen's College.

Rev. John Eddy, Trinity College.

Rev. Elisha William Hood, Wadham College.

Rev. Edward Woodhouse, Pembroke College.

George Trevelyan, Fellow of Merton College.

Edward Baldwin, St. John's College.

March 22.

Rev. Richard Bingham, Magdalen Hall.

Rev. Thomas Harman, Queen's College.

John Horndon, Exeter College.

BACHELORS OF ARTS.

February 1.

John Henry Arnold Walsh, Balliol College, grand compounder.

John Whitmore Wall, Fellow of New College.

William Hale, Magdalen Hall.

Robert Isham, Brasenose College.

Richard Tarbutt, Brasenose College.

John Turner Colman Fawcett, Student of Christ Church.

William James Easley Bennett, Student of Christ Church.

Cecil William Page, Student of Christ Church.

Kenrick William Collett, Christ Church.

William Annesley, University College.

Charles Robert Butler, Worcester College.

February 8.

Thomas John Heming, Christ Church, grand compounder.

Edward Cave, Brasenose College.

James Mackell, Brasenose College.

George Cary Elwes, Trinity College.

Patrick Murray Smythe, Christ Church.

John Gower, Magdalen College.

Samuel Beckwith, St. John's College.

Charles Nicoll, Exeter College.

February 15.

Charles Denham Orlando Jephson, Brasenose College, grand compounder.

Thomas Gordon Penn, Christ Church.

James Clay, Balliol College.

John Day, Exeter College.

February 22.

Charles John Boyle, Fellow of All Souls' College.

John Mitchinson Calvert, Oriel College.

John David Chambers, Oriel College.

Henry Beckley, Exeter College.

March 8.

Marcus Richard Southwell, Exeter College, grand compounder.

Thomas Dawson Hudson, Exeter College.

March 15.

William Drummond, Trinity College, grand compounder.

March 22.

The Right Hon. Philip Henry, Viscount Mahon, Christ Church.

Thomas Gladstone, Christ Church.

William John Blake, Christ Church.

Charles Dacres Bevan, Balliol College.

John Horne, Exeter College.

MISCELLANEOUS INTELLIGENCE.

Dr. Buckland, the Reader in Mineralogy and Geology, has recently received a letter from Rome, announcing that the writer, Stephen Jarrett, Esq., Gentleman Commender of Magdalen College, has purchased a very valuable collection of marbles, &c. in that city, for the purpose of presenting them to this University. This collection has been formed by an Advocate of Rome, Signor Corsi, during a residence there of

many years, and consists of one thousand polished pieces, all exactly of the same size, of every variety of granite, sienite, porphyry, serpentine, and jasper marble, alabaster, &c. that is known to exist. The size of each piece being that of a small octavo volume, is sufficient to show the effect *en masse* of each substance it contains.

The Wardenship of All Souls' College, in this University, having become vacant by the death of the Hon. and Right Rev. Edward Legge, Lord Bishop of Oxford, the College elected the Rev. Lewis Sneyd, M.A. Fellow of that Society, Rector of Headley, in Surrey, and Chaplain to the Earl of Plymouth, to be Warden; their election has been confirmed by the nomination of his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury.

January 29.

The Election took place for a Margaret Professor of Divinity, in the room of the late Provost of Queen's, when the Rev. Godfrey Faussett, B.D. late Fellow of Magdalen College, was the successful Candidate. The numbers were as follow :

The Rev. Dr. Nares, Merton College, Regius Professor of Modern History	33
The Rev. Dr. Shuttleworth, Warden of New College . . .	19
The Rev. Godfrey Faussett, Magdalen College	42

Total . . 94

February 1.

The Rev. John Fox, M.A. Fellow of Queen's College, was unanimously elected Provost of that Society, in the room of the late Rev. Septimus Collinson, D.D.

Same day Mr. Charles Lewis Cornish was elected an Exhibitioner on Mr. Michel's Foundation at Queen's College.

February 13.

The nomination of the Rev. Edward Cardwell, B.D. as a Delegate of the Press, in the room of the Hon. and Right Rev. the late Bishop of Oxford, was unanimously approved of in Convocation.

February 16.

Mr. Anthony Grant was admitted actual Fellow of New College.

February 18.

Mr. Robert Evans, Scholar of Jesus College, and Vinerian Scholar, was elected Fellow of that Society.

February 22.

In full Congregation, Stephen Peter Rigaud, Esq. M.A. late Fellow of Exeter

College, was admitted to the Professorship of Astronomy, on the foundation of Sir Henry Savile, vacant by the death of the late Abram Robertson, D.D. of Christ Church; and at the same time the Rev. Baden Powell, M.A. of Oriel College, was admitted to the Professorship of Geometry, vacated by Mr. Rigaud's acceptance of the Astronomical chair.

February 27.

In full convocation, the University Seal was affixed to Petitions to both Houses of Parliament, praying that the Laws by which Persons professing the Roman Catholic Religion are precluded from holding certain offices, and from sitting in Parliament, may not be repealed.

March 3.

Henry Griffith, B.A. of Jesus College, was admitted Scholar of that Society.

March 4.

Mr. Charles Wells was admitted actual Fellow of New College.

March 7.

The Proctors for the ensuing year were elected by their respective Societies, and their election announced to the Vice-Chancellor. The Proctors elect are, the Rev. Charles Thomas Longley, M.A. Student of Christ Church; and the Rev. Andrew Edwards, M.A. Fellow of Magdalen College.

March 10.

Mr. Newton Burton Young was admitted Actual Fellow of New College.

March 12.

Mr. Wm. Henry Newbolt was admitted Actual Fellow of New College.

March 17.

The Rev. George Davies, Kent, M.A. was admitted a Probationary Fellow of Corpus Christi College; and Mr. George Edward Deacon, of the county of Hants, Mr. Charles Balston, of the county of Kent, and Mr. Frederick Holme, of the county of Gloucester, were admitted Scholars of that Society.

March 20.

The nomination of Mr. Round, of Balliol College, and Mr. Thomas, of Pembroke College, as public Examiners in *Literis Humanioribus*, and of Mr. Saunders, of Christ Church, in *Disciplinis Mathematicis et Physicis*, were unanimously approved in Convocation.

March 22.

Mr. Travers Twiss, Commoner of University College, was elected a Scholar of that Society, on the Bennett foundation.

March 23.

Mr. Andrew Douglas Stacpoole, of New

College, was admitted an actual Fellow of that Society.

The Public Examiners, nominated in the room of those gentlemen who have continued in office for the period fixed by Statute, are,

IN LITERIS HUMANIORIBUS.

The Rev. James Thomas Round, M.A. Fellow of Balliol College.

The Rev. William Beach Thomas, M.A. Scholar of Pembroke College.

IN DISCIPLINIS MATHEMATICIS ET
PHYSICIS.

The Rev. Augustus Page Saunders, M.A. Student of Christ Church.

The Examiners appointed by the Trustees of Dean Ireland's Foundation, were the Rev. Dr. Bull, Student of Christ Church, the Rev. Mr. Symons, Fellow of Wadham College, and the Rev. Mr. Keble, Fellow of Oriel College. The Examination for the Ireland Scholarship was holden in the Convocation House on Friday, March 23.—The Scholarship is open to all Under Graduates who have not exceeded their sixteenth term.

SUMMARY OF THE MEMBERS OF THE
UNIVERSITY, JANUARY, 1827.

	Members of Con- vocation.	Members on the Books.
1 University . . .	113 . .	215
2 Balliol . . .	86 . .	223
3 Merton . . .	71 . .	127
4 Exeter . . .	94 . .	251
5 Oriel . . .	145 . .	283
6 Queen's . . .	142 . .	328
7 New . . .	72 . .	149
8 Lincoln . . .	58 . .	136
9 All Souls . . .	65 . .	90
10 Magdalen . . .	117 . .	168
11 Brasennose . . .	222 . .	404
12 Corpus . . .	73 . .	121
13 Christ Church . . .	418 . .	825
14 Trinity . . .	97 . .	233
15 St. John's . . .	129 . .	224
16 Jesus . . .	51 . .	177
17 Wadham . . .	72 . .	186
18 Pembroke . . .	68 . .	168
19 Worcester . . .	85 . .	225
20 St. Mary Hall . . .	33 . .	89
21 Magdalen Hall . . .	43 . .	153
22 New Inn Hall . . .	1 . .	1
23 St. Alban Hall . . .	12 . .	44
24 St. Edmund Hall . . .	45 . .	103
	2312	4923

Matriculations	400
Regents	182
Determining Bachelors in Lent . . .	256

CAMBRIDGE.

DEGREES CONFERRED FROM JANUARY TO MARCH, INCLUSIVE.

BACHELORS IN DIVINITY.

March 7.

Robert George Suckling Browne, St. John's College.

Robert Ferrier Blake, Caius College.

MASTERS OF ARTS.

February 7.

Rev. Thomas Earle Pipon, St. John's College.

March 7.

William Butt, Downing College.

Rev. Richard Swann Robin, Catharine Hall.

March 20.

Edw. St. Aubyn, Trinity College.

BACHELORS IN CIVIL LAW.

March 7.

William Jackman, Trinity Hall.

John Phillips, Trinity Hall.

BACHELORS OF ARTS.

February 7.

Lewis Garland, Trinity College.

Thomas Sikes, Queen's College.

February 28.

Henry Morris Cockshott, Trinity College.

William White, Trinity College.

Richard Tyacke, St. John's College.

Thomas Mills, Clare Hall.

William Tyrer, Catharine Hall.

Thomas Smith Howard, Emmanuel College.

March 7.

Henry H. Franklin, Corpus Christi College.

The Rev. John Merewether, M.A. of Queen's College, Oxford, and the Rev. John Twycross, B.A. of Trinity College, Dublin, were admitted *ad eundem*.

PUBLIC EXAMINATIONS.

The following is the List of Honours adjudged at the Examinations for Degrees, holden in the Senate House, January 20.

WRANGLERS.

- | | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1 Gordon, Peter's Coll. | 13 Stuart, Queen's Coll. | 24 Colville, John's Coll. |
| 2 Turner, Trin. | 14 Moore, Qu. | 25 Dodd, C. C. C. |
| 3 Cleansby, Trin. | 15 Hoare, Joh. | 26 North, Joh. |
| 4 De Morgan, Trin. | 16 King, C. C. C. | 27 Kempthorne, Joh. |
| 5 Cankrien, Trin. | 17 Biley, Clare. | 28 Carus, Trin. |
| 6 Yate, Joh. | 18 Charlesworth, Trin. | 29 Webster, Trin. |
| 7 Hopkins, Pet. | 19 Pinder, Cai. | 30 Burnaby, Cai. |
| 8 Butterson, Joh. | 20 Cooper, Trin. | 31 Dawes, Cai. |
| 9 Tinklar, C. C. C. | 21 Lewis, Trin. | 32 Farre, Joh. |
| 10 Thompson, Joh. | 22 Kelly, Cai. | 33 Dobbs, Trin. |
| 11 Peacock, Joh. | 23 Brooke, Joh. | 34 Jarreth, Cath. |
| 12 Venn, Qu. | | |

SENIOR OPTIMES.

- | | | |
|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1 Hovenden, Trin. | 13 Newland, C. C. C. | 25 Rees, Joh. |
| 2 Beechey, Cai. | 14 Talbot, Trin. | 26 Dewdney, Joh. |
| 3 Eade, Cai. | 15 Sanders, Pemb. | 27 Walford, Trin. |
| 4 Cumby, C. C. C. | 16 Luard, Joh. | 28 Kennedy, Joh. |
| 5 Haslewood, Joh. | 17 Barrs, jun. Joh. | 29 Lay, Joh. |
| 6 Owen, Joh. | 18 Stammers, Joh. | 30 Dykes, } <i>æq.</i> C. C. C. |
| 7 Bunch, Emm. | 19 Grose, Clare. | 31 Sergeant } <i>æq.</i> Pet. |
| 8 Roswell, Sid. | 20 Paull, Joh. | 32 Johnson, Joh. |
| 9 Colbeck, Emm. | 21 Fosbrooke, Pemb. | 33 Bowstead, Joh. |
| 10 P. Smith, Trin. | 22 Deans, Chr. | 34 Cooper, Pemb. |
| 11 Cape, C. C. C. | 23 Appleton, Trin. | 35 Leatherdale, Joh. |
| 12 Row, Cai. | 24 Spyers, Joh. | |

JUNIOR OPTIMES.

- | | | |
|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| 1 Cartwright, Chr. | 8 Easton, Emm. | 15 Vinall, Cath. |
| 2 Collyer, Trin. | 9 S. Smith, Trin. | 16 Breynton, Magd. |
| 3 Kenrick, Trin. | 10 Bernard, C. C. C. | 17 Braine, Trin. |
| 4 Chatfield, Trin. | 11 Willan, Pet. | 18 Woodhouse, Sid. |
| 5 Cottingham, Clare. | 12 Antrobus, Joh. | 19 Appleyard, Cai. |
| 6 Malins, Cai. | 13 Barrs, sen. Joh. | 20 Robson, Trin. |
| 7 Stainforth, Qu. | 14 Cartmel, Pemb. | |

- | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-------|
| 1 Jones, Cath. | 62 Wales, Cath. | 123 Bond, C. C. C. | |
| 2 Hensley, Cath. | 63 Cobbold, Cai. | 124 Bull, } | Joh. |
| 3 Groves, Chr. | 64 Franklin, C. C. C. | 125 Gilby, sen. } | Clare |
| 4 Litchfield, Trin. | 65 Jordan, Clare. | 126 Singleton, Qu. | |
| 5 Woods, Emm. | 66 Willan, Chr. | 127 Woodley, Pet. | |
| 6 Whitmore, Trin. | 67 A. Pearson, Trin. | 128 Tyacke, Joh. | |
| 7 Blackwell, Cath. | 68 Fonnereau, Trin. | 129 Coke, Trin. | |
| 8 Gibson, Trin. | 69 Henslow, Jes. | 130 Yerbury, Trin. | |
| 9 Clarke, Qu. | 70 Sprowle, Jes. | 131 Murray, Pet. | |
| 10 Waddington, Trin. | 71 Soltau, Trin. | 132 Garland, Trin. | |
| 11 Clements, Qu. | 72 Berwick, } Qu. | 133 Rice, Trin. | |
| 12 Booth, } Qu. | 73 Huyshe, } Sid. | 134 Boydell, Magd. | |
| 13 Cooper, } Qu. | 74 Offley, Joh. | 135 J. Davis, Joh. | |
| 14 Cotron, Pemb. | 75 Martin, Trin. | 136 Tooke, Trin. | |
| 15 Parker, Trin. | 76 Smith, jun. Magd. | 137 Woodward, Joh. | |
| 16 Owen, Magd. | 77 Corset, } Trin. | 138 Grice, Qu. | |
| 17 Jarvis, Pemb. | 78 Hutt, } Trin. | 139 Wilson, Trin. | |
| 18 White, Qu. | 79 Watson, Trin. | 140 Brett, Trin. | |
| 19 Hotchin, Cai. | 80 Drummond, Trin. | 141 Brewin, Trin. | |
| 20 Massingberd, Down. | 81 Cockshott, Trin. | 142 Gilby, jun. Trin. | |
| 21 Harrison, Chr. | 82 Riddall, Chr. | 143 Bloom, Cai. | |
| 22 Fitzherbert, Qu. | 83 I. Pearson, Trin. | 144 Burroughs, Joh. | |
| 23 Reeks, Clare. | 84 Barwick, Magd. | 145 Digby, Joh. | |
| 24 Livesay, Joh. | 85 Sanders, Pet. | 146 Clive, Joh. | |
| 25 Richardson, Chr. | 86 Yule, Jes. | 147 Hare, Qu. | |
| 26 Beeson, Joh. | 87 Beath, Joh. | 148 Rawlins, Trin. | |
| 27 Livesay, Clare. | 88 Meech, Emm. | 149 Everett, Joh. | |
| 28 Shaw, Trin. | 89 Nesfield, Jes. | 150 Morse, C. C. C. | |
| 29 Prideaux Trin. | 90 Ridsdale, Pet. | 151 White, Trin. | |
| 30 Phillips, Qu. | 91 Delacour, Joh. | 152 Myall, Cath. | |
| 31 Howarth, Cai. | 92 Lyall, Chr. | 153 Maude, Jes. | |
| 32 Priaux, Cath. | 93 Crompton, Trin. | 154 Wymer, Joh. | |
| 33 Goodhart, Trin. | 94 Browne, } Joh. | 155 Wright, Trin. | |
| 34 Byron, Emm. | 95 Tayleure, } Trin. | 156 Smith, sen. Magd. | |
| 35 Russell, Cath. | 96 Frankish, Joh. | 157 Smyth, Tr. H. | |
| 36 Wallace, Trin. | 97 Booth, Qu. | 158 Rawlins, Emm. | |
| 37 Pope, Trin. | 98 Hooper, Emm. | 159 Macarthy, Pet. | |
| 38 Daniel, } Chr. | 99 Emmett, Trin. | 160 Cheere, Joh. | |
| 39 Rennie, } Trin. | 100 Smith, Cath. | 161 Marcus, Qu. | |
| 40 Atkinson, Trin. | 101 Clay, Sid. | 162 Hoyle, Joh. | |
| 41 Holte, Trin. | 102 Chell, sen. Joh. | 163 Hutchins, C. C. C. | |
| 42 Grainger, Down. | 103 Docker, Pemb. | 164 Goodwin, Em. | |
| 43 Shackleton, Trin. | 104 Hume, Joh. | 165 Packe, Chr. | |
| 44 T. T. Smyth, Qu. | 105 E. H. Smith, Qu. | 166 Gooden, Jes. | |
| 45 Marsden, Joh. | 106 Ely, Joh. | 167 Inge, Trin. | |
| 46 Cann, Pemb. | 107 Lord Douro, Trin. | | |
| 47 Neeld, Trin. | 108 Lake, Jes. | 168 Agar, Jes. | |
| 48 Seckerson, Cath. | 109 Finch, Trin. | 169 Biddulph, Clare. | |
| 49 Greig, Trin. | 110 Lillingston, Emm. | 170 Bowden, Qu. | |
| 50 Stephenson, Jes. | 111 Prescott, Trin. | 171 Chell, jun. Joh. | |
| 51 Smith, C. C. C. | 112 Medicott, } Qu. | 172 Cheere, Qu. | |
| 52 Scott, Trin. | 113 Tryon, } Trin. | 173 Cricklow, Trin. | |
| 53 Mead, Joh. | 114 Gwyther, Joh. | 174 Darby, Down. | |
| 54 Hall, Trin. | 115 Hey, C. C. C. | 175 Dymocke, Trin. | |
| 55 Williams, Chr. | 116 Cresswell, Joh. | 176 Gibson, Jes. | |
| 56 Sikes, Qu. | 117 Gray, Trin. | 177 Greene, Jes. | |
| 57 Capper, Qu. | 118 Addis, Trin. | 178 Hartley, Chr. | |
| 58 Commins, Cath. | 119 Franklin, Clare. | 179 Hutchins, Jes. | |
| 59 Heathcote, Joh. | 120 Latener, Jes. | 180 Kitchin, Qu. | |
| 60 Steward, C. C. C. | 121 York, Joh. | 181 Lawson, Sid. | |
| 61 Pulleine, Trin. | 122 Cheere, Joh. | 182 Leach, Jes. | |

183 Ness, C. C. C.

184 Powel, Pet.

185 Pullen, Qu.

186 Scott, Pet.

187 Spenser, Qu.

188 Sprigge, Pet.

189 Stimson, Cai.

190 Stopford, Trin.

191 Strangways, Joh.

The Senior Wrangler is a Hat Fellow Commoner, and son of Sir Willoughby Gordon, Bart. Quarter-Master-General. It is a circumstance almost unprecedented in this University, that a gentleman of Mr. Gordon's rank should obtain the highest mathematical honour of the year.

THE BRACKETS.

Gordon, Pet.

Cleasby, } Trin.
Turner, }

De Morgara, Trin.

Butterton, Joh.

Cankrien, Pet.

Hopkins, Trin.

Yate, John.

Hoare, Joh.

Moore, Qu.

Peacock, Joh.

Stuart, Qu.

Thompson, Joh.

Tinklar, C. C. C.

Venn, Qu.

Beachey, Cai.

Biley, Clare.

Brooke, Joh.

Burnaby, Caius.

Carus, } Trin.

Charlesworth, }

Colville, Joh.

Cooper, Trin.

Davies, Caius.

Dobbs, Trin.

Dodd, C. C. C.

Farne, Joh.

Hovenden, Trin.

Jarrett, Cath.

Kelly, Caius.

Kempthorne, Joh.

King, C. C. C.

Lewis, Trin.

North, Joh.

Pinder, Caius.

Webster, Trin.

Bunch, } Emm.
Colbeck, }

Cumby, C. C. C.

Eade, Caius.

Haslewood, } Joh.

Owen, }

Rowsell, Sid.

P. Smith, Trin.

Barrs, Joh.

Cape, C. C. C.

Deans, Chr.

Fosbrooke, Pem.

Grose, Clare.

Luard, Joh.

Newland, C. C. C.

Paull, Joh.

Rose, Caius.

Saunders, Pemb.

Stammers, Joh.

Talbot, Trin.

Appleton, Trin.

Bowstead, Joh.

Cooper, Pemb.

Dewdney, Joh.

Dykes, Pet.

Johnson, }

Kennedy, }

Lay, }

Leatherdale, }

Rees, }

Spyers, }

Serjeant, C. C. C.

Walford, Trin.

Antrobus, Joh.

Appleyard, Caius.

Barrs, Joh.

Bernard, C. C. C.

Brane, Trin.

Breynton, Magd.

Cartmell, Pemb.

Cartwright, Christ.

Chatford, } Trin.

Collyer, }

Cottingham, Clare.

Caston, Emim.

Kenrick, Trin.

Malins, Caius.

Robson, } Trin.

S. Smith, }

Stainforth, Qu.

Vinall, Cath.

Willan, Pet.

Woodhouse, Sid.

W. G. Smith, Trinity College, Fenn, Trinity College, and Hill, St. John's College, who had passed their Examinations on a former occasion, were admitted Bachelors of Arts.

The following gentlemen were admitted to *Ægotat* Degrees:—

Helsham, C. C. C.

Wilson, Cath.

Armitage, Trin.

Cubitt, Caius.

Langton, Caius.

Livingston, Joh.

CLASSICAL TRIPOS, 1827.

FIRST CLASS.

Ds. Kennedy, Joh.
Hovenden, Trin.
Butterton, Joh.
Percy Smith, Trin.
Chatfield, Trin.

Hoare, Joh.

Jarrett, Cath.

Rees, Joh.

Carus, Trin.

Ds. Talbot, Trin.
Walford, Trin.
Branie, Trin.
Cleasby, Trin.
Robson, Trin.

SECOND CLASS.

Collyer, Trin.
Appleyard, Caius.
Appleton, Trin.Ds. Vinall, Cath.
Kempthorne, Joh.
Peacock, Joh.

THIRD CLASS.

Spyers, Joh.
Willan, Pet.
Charlesworth, Trin.
Paull, Joh.
Cottingham, Clare.

The Rev. Temple Chevallier, M.A. of Catharine Hall, has been re-appointed Hulsean Lecturer for the year 1827.

The Rev. Challis Pairoissien, M. A. Fellow of Clare Hall, has been elected one of the Senior Fellows of that Society.

In conformity with the regulations passed by the Senate, March 13, 1822, notice has been given that the following are to be the subjects of examination in the last week of the Lent Term, 1828.

1. The Gospel of St. Mark.
2. Paley's Evidences of Christianity.
3. The First and Second Books of Xenophon's Memorabilia.
4. The Second Book of Horace's Epistles.

Lord Norreys, eldest son of the Earl of Abingdon, is admitted of Trinity College.

January 26.

Mr. Comyns Tucker, of St. Peter's College, was elected University Scholar on the foundation of Sir William Browne.

February 7.

At a Congregation this day a Grace passed the Senate, appointing the Rev. G. Skinner, of Jesus College, the Rev. J. Weller, of Emmanuel, and Mr. Platt, of Trinity, (who is deputy for the Regius Professor of Hebrew,) examiners of the Candidates for the Hebrew Scholarships.

At the same Congregation Richard Thomas Lowe, B.A. of Christ College, was elected Travelling Bachelor, on the nomination of the Master of that Society.

February 13.

The Master and Fellows of Peterhouse unanimously elected Henry Percy Gordon, Esq. (Senior Wrangler of the present year) Honorary Fellow of that Society.

March 3.

The Rev. Robert Andrews, M.A. and the Rev. Henry Fearon, B.A. of Emmanuel College, were elected Fellows on the foundation of that Society.

At the same Congregation, Graces to the following effect passed the Senate:—

To affix the University Seal to a letter intended to accompany the books presented by the University to the library of Bishop's College, Calcutta, and to another letter accompanied by a similar donation to the library of Lampeter College, Diocese of St. David's.

To allow a sum not exceeding £150 from the common chest for book-cases and cabinets to preserve the books, &c. under

the custody of Dr. Walker's reader at the Botanic Garden.

March 10.

James Prince Lee, of Trinity College, was elected University Scholar on Lord Craven's Foundation. The Examiners of the Candidates determined that Lofft, of King's, and Wordsworth, sen. of Trinity, should be re-examined.

March 16.

William Williamson, Esq. B.A. of Clare Hall, was elected a Foundation Fellow of that Society.

PRIZES.

SMITH'S PRIZES.

[Of £25 each to the best Proficients in Mathematics and Natural Philosophy among the commencing Bachelors of Arts.]

Adjudged as follows:—

First prize.—Ds. Turner, Trin. 2d wrangler.

Second prize.—Ds. Henry Percy Gordon, Pet. 1st wrangler.

NORRISIAN PRIZE.

Subject.—“The Mosaic Dispensation not intended to be perpetual.”

Adjudged to

Francis White, Trinity College.

TYRWHITT'S HEBREW SCHOLARSHIPS.

The Vice-Chancellor and the Official Electors of these Scholarships have given notice in pursuance of the 13th regulation of the Senate, bearing date the 14th March, 1826, that a Premium of £50 will be given for the best Dissertation

“On the Character and Authority of the Targum of Jonathan on the Prophecy of Isaiah, with a particular reference to those passages which relate to the Messiah.”

The Dissertations are to be in Latin, the Candidates must have taken their first degree, and the exercises are to be sent in (with motto and paper containing the author's name sealed up in the usual manner) to the Vice-Chancellor on or before the 1st day of December next.

CHANCELLOR'S MEDALS.

[For the two best proficients in Clerical Learning among the Commencing Bachelors of Arts.]

Adjudged to

Benjamin Hall Kennedy, St. John's.
Valentine Fowler Hovenden, Trinity College.

SEATONIAN PRIZE.

Subject for the present year,
“The Marriage at Cana in Galilee.”

UNIVERSITY OF DUBLIN.

The Vice-Chancellor's Prizes to Graduates have been adjudged to Messrs. Taylor, Smith, and O'Donohue; and for Undergraduates, to Messrs. Hardy, Pollock, Meredith, Boyle, and Crosthwaite.

The Berkeley Medals, for proficiency

in the Greek language, and regular attendance at the lecture of the Greek Professor for the last year, have been given to the following Bachelors:—George Sidney Smith and M'Caule.

WESTMINSTER SCHOOL.

The names of the candidates examined on Wednesday, February 7, at Westminster School, for the writership given by Mr. Wynn, were Messrs. Fronde and Allen, King's Scholars; and Messrs. Davis, Escombe, Bailey, and Finlater, town boys. The examination, after continuing from ten o'clock till five, was adjourned. The subjects of examination for the day were the Greek and Latin

Classics, Geography and Roman History. The examiners were Dr. Batten, Principal of Haleybury College, and Mr. Tyler, Fellow of Oriel College, and Mr. Cramer, late Student of Christ Church, Oxford. These gentlemen, we understand, expressed themselves most favourably upon the performances of all the candidates. Mr. Wynn and many other gentlemen were present during the examination.

ST. DAVID'S COLLEGE, LAMPETER.

The opening of this Institution, to which so much interest is attached, took place on the 1st of March; but, in consequence of the unavoidable absence of the Lord Bishop, it was not accompanied with any public ceremony. The Solemnities expected to be attendant on an

event, so proud to Wales, were therefore, in accordance with the wishes of the Governors of the College, deferred to a future opportunity, when the College Chapel will be consecrated with a ceremony befitting the sacred occasion.

INDEX OF BOOKS REVIEWED.

* * * For Remarkable Passages in the Criticisms, Extracts, Ecclesiastical and other Intelligence, see the Index at the end of the Volume.

B.

- Bailey*, (Rev. B.) the Office of an Evangelist and Physician of the Soul; an Ordination Sermon, 374.
Bayley, (Rev. Dr.) Visitation Charge to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Stow, 422.
Berens, (Rev. Edw.) Visitation Sermons, 211.
Blunt, (Rev. Henry) Funeral Sermon on General Calvert, 99.
Butler, (Rev. Dr.) Visitation Charges, in 1825 and 1826, to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Derby, 94.

C.

- Carpenter*, (Wm.) Popular Introduction to the Study of the Scriptures, 101.
Champollion (M.) *le Jeune*, *Precis du Systeme Hieroglyphique des anciens Egyptiens*, 141.
 ———, *Lettres à M. le Duc de Blacas*, *ib.*
Chester, (Rt. Rev. the Lord Bishop of) Sermon before the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, 493.
Commissioners of Education in Ireland, First Report of, 1.
Copleston, (Rev. Dr. Edward) Sermon, preached on 5th of Nov. at Chester, 482.
Cramer, (Rev. J. A.) Geographical and Historical Description of Ancient Italy, 25.

D.

- Drummond*, (Sir William) *Origines, or Remarks on the Origin of several Empires, &c.* 399.

E.

- Elmsley* (Petr.) *Scholia in Sophoclis Trægædias*, 281.

F.

- Forster*, (Rev. Charles) *Critical Essays on Genesis xx. and on Matthew ii. 17, 18, 341.*

G.

- Garbett*, (Rev. John) Letter to Dr. Milner, 489.

H.

- Hale*, (Rev. W. H.) *Observations on Clerical Funds*, 171.
Heber, (Rt. Rev. Reginald, Bishop of Calcutta) Farewell Sermon, 219.
 ———, Sermon at the Consecration of the Church of Secrole, *ib.*
Hornby, (Rev. J. J.) the Principle of Ecclesiastical Order explained; an Ordination Sermon, 422.

INDEX.

I.

Inquisition of Spain, History of, 119.

J.

Jerram, (Rev. Charles) Two Visitation Sermons, 110.

Jolly, (Rt. Rev. Alexander) Friendly Address to the Episcopalians of Scotland, on Regeneration, 374.

L.

London, (Rt. Rev. the Lord Bishop of) Visitation Charge, 162.

London University, Prospectus of, 175.

Lord Mayor's Visit to Oxford, 473.

Low, (Rt. Rev. David) Charge to the Clergy of the Episcopal Communion of Ross and Argyle, 374.

Lowe, (Rev. T. H.) Two Letters to Dr. Milner, 489.

Lux Renata ; a Protestant's Epistle, 464.

M.

Merewether, (Rev. Francis) Thoughts on the Erection of a Chapel of Ease, 215.

Miller, (Rev. Dr. Geo.) Historical View of the Plea of Tradition, &c. 92.

Milman, (Rev. H. H.) Visitation Sermon, 213.

N.

Nolan, (Rev. Frederick) the Expectation formed by the Assyrians, that a great Deliverer would appear, &c. 444.

P.

Patteson, (Rev. Edward) Sermons, 358.

Penrose, (Rev. John) Treatise on the Evidence of Scripture Miracles, 60.

R.

Robinson, (Rev. Thomas) Funeral Sermon on Bishop Heber, 219.

Rose, (Rev. Hugh James) Commencement Sermon at Cambridge, 175.

S.

Scholz, (Dr. J. M. A.) Reise in den Jahren 1820 und 1821, 362.

Sharpe, (Rev. Dr. Thomas) Life of Archbishop Sharpe, 321.

Sophoclis Tragediæ Septem, 281.

T.

Turner, (Sharon) History of the Reign of Henry the Eighth, 380.

V.

Vaughan, (Rev. E. T.) Cæsar and God ; a Sermon, 348.

INDEX

OF THE

REMARKABLE PASSAGES

IN THE

CRITICISMS, EXTRACTS, ECCLESIASTICAL AND UNIVERSITY INTELLIGENCE.

A.

- Abbott* (Lord Chief Justice) argument and opinion of, on the validity of special resignation bonds, 531—534.
Annuities to clergymen's widows, plan of a society for, 171—173—remarks thereon, 173, 174.
Antiquarian Researches, fair estimate of, 25, 26.
Apparatus, costly, not necessary for Museums, 193.
Archdeacon's office, observations on, 425, 426.
Association for discountenancing vice in Ireland, origin and establishment of, 17—its objects, 18—remarks on the success of its schools, 19.
Assyrian Monarchy, remarks on the chronology of, 400—402—on the Assyrian expectations of a Deliverer, 447—460.

B

- Babylonian Monarchy*, remarks on the chronology of, 402—416.
Bailey (Rev. B.) observations of, on the duty of an evangelist, 379.
Balaam, observations on the history and character of, 451, 452—and on his prophecy, 452—460.
Baptism, administration of, in private, remarks on, 427, 428—importance of the public celebration of, 428.
Baptismal regeneration, observations on, 112, 113.
Battle of Pavia, 388.

- Baxter* (Richard) liberal conduct of, towards Mr. (afterwards) Archbishop Sharpe, 324.
Bedouins, manners of, 365—367, 368.
Benjamin, typical coincidence between the history of the birth of, and of that of Christ's nativity, 346, 347.
Berens (Rev. Edward) observations of, on the duty of the clergy to visit their parishioners, 212.
Blomfield (Rt. Rev. C. J. Bishop of Chester) tribute of, to the characters and memories of Bishops Middleton and Heber, 494—496.
Blunt (Rev. Henry) extract from a funeral sermon by, 99, 100—remarks thereon, 100, 101.
Boleyn (Anne) address of, 393—nature of the charges against her, 394—summary of the evidence for and against her, 395, 396.
Bonds of Resignation (special,) argument of Mr. Justice Gaselee, on the legality of, 495—509—of Mr. Baron Hullock, 509—531—of Lord Chief Justice Abbott, 531—534.
Bourbon (Constable) intrigues of, with Henry VIII. 387.
Bower (Archibald) character of, 124.
Brougham (Mr.) remarks on the bill of, for extending national education, 1—observations of, on the utility of cheap publications for the people, 185—strictures on his exclusion of religion, 186—194, 195—on economy of philosophical apparatus, 193, 194.
Burnet's (Bishop) character of Archbishop Sharpe, 324.

Butler (Rev. Dr.) important information communicated by, relative to the present state of the Church Establishment in the Archdeaconry of Derby, 95, 96—on the education of the lower orders, 97, 98.

C.

Cairo, population of, 371—literary institutions there, *ib.*

Cambridge University, proceedings of, 269—273, 548—551—number of members of, 272.

Campbell (Dr.) observations of, on demoniacal possessions, 67, note.

Carlos (Don) character of, 136—antipathy of, to his father, *ib.*—steps taken to make him confess, 137, 138—his death, 139.

Carpenter (William) instances of his plagiarisms from Mr. Horne's Introduction to the Scriptures, 102—109—and from Dr. Adam Clarke's Commentary, 106, 107.

Catechizing, remarks on the disuse of, 429.

Celts, reasons for concluding that Italy was first peopled by, 33—38.

Champollion (M.) propositions established by, relating to the hieroglyphics of the Egyptians, 142—Forms of the signs by which the Egyptians expressed their ideas, 143—style of their execution, 144—number of really differing hieroglyphic characters, 145—classes under which they may be distributed, *ib.*—different kinds of symbols, *ib.* 146—why some phonetic hieroglyphics were used in preference to others, 148—explanation of a passage of Clemens Alexandrinus, relative to the epistolographic, hieratic and hieroglyphic writing of the Egyptians, 149, 150—use of the different kinds of hieroglyphics, 151—particularly of the epistolographic or demotic, and hieratic, 152—obligations of M. Champollion to the previous researches of Dr. Young, 153, 154—results of M. Champollion's researches, 155, 156—names of the Pharaohs, ascertained by him, 156—158—chronological data, illustrating certain dynasties of Egyptian kings mentioned by Manetho, 159—161.

Christenings in private, censured, 427—importance of solemnizing them publicly, 428.

Christian Knowledge, Society for promoting, memorial of, to the Directors of the East India Company, for augment-

ing the number of Bishops in India, 241—243—line of conduct pursued by the society and its missionaries, 244.

Church of England, encouraging prospects of, 170—Archbishop Sharpe's opinion of, 332—prospects of, 438—440—Law proceedings relative to the church, 497—534.

Church of Rome, fundamental distinction between, and those who differ from her, 485, 486.

Clergy, observations on the duties of, 167—particularly, visiting their parishioners, 212—in what manner they should perform the occasional offices, 168—the societies belonging to the Church of England particularly recommended to them, 169—plan of Diocesan Societies for securing annuities to their widows, 171—174—affecting appeal in behalf of the clergy, 217, 218—laborious duties of, 433, 434—address to, on the subject of field sports, 434, 435—437—importance and sacredness of their calling, 438, on their obligations, 439, 440—arguments of the judges on the legality of special bonds of resignation, 497—534.

Climate of Italy, changes wrought in, 52, 53.

Commissioners for Education in Ireland, remarks on the selection of, 2—9, and on their interpretation of the act of 28 Henry VIII., which enjoins the clergy to keep parochial schools, 15, 16—their charges against the Incorporated Society refuted, 5, 6—system of education recommended by them for Ireland, 21, 22—remarks thereon, 23—25.

Conformity, on the limits of, 360.

Copleston (Rev. Dr.) plan of his sermon on Nov. 5th, 483—on the conformity of the worship of the Church of Rome to the Jewish ritual, 484—fundamental distinction between the Church of Rome and those who differ from her, 485, 486—excellent advice, suited to the present day, 486, 487—on the little authority due to the declarations of some Roman Catholics, disavowing the opinions with which they are charged as a body, 487, 488.

Copts or descendants of the ancient Egyptians, notice of, 370, 371.

Coustos (John) sufferings of, in the Inquisition, 123.

Cramer (Rev. J. A.) importance of his illustrations of Livy, 27—29—correctness of his Map of Italy, 28, 29—remarks on his opinion that the first set-

ulers of Italy and Greece were of the same race, 33, 34—his account of the manner in which the Pelasgic adventurers overspread Italy, 42, 43—on the decline and ruin of the power of the Tuscans, 45—on the uncertainty of the early history of Rome, 45, 46—on the changes wrought in the climate and temperature of Italy, 52, 53.

D.

Davy (Sir Humphrey) opinion of, on the destruction of Herculaneum, 54, 55.

Deaths, happy, observations on, 339.

Deliverer, observations on the Assyrian expectations of, 452—460.

Demoniacal possessions, mentioned in the New Testament, reality of, 66, 67, note.

Derby (Archdeaconry of) state of the Church establishment in, 95—97.

Dillon (Rev. R. C.) the historiographer of the Lord Mayor's visit to Oxford, 474—his description of their departure, 475—arrival at Oxford, and reception by the Mayor, 476, 477—his account of the dinner given by the Lord Mayor, 478, 479—the return described, 479, 480—the chaplain's concluding reflections, 481.

Dioceses, state of, in England and Wales, 250—261. 535—543.

Dissent, appeal of a clergyman to his parishioners on, 216.

Douglas (Bishop) vindicated from the charge of falsely translating an authority cited by him, 492, 493.

Drummond (Sir William) analysis of his observations on the chronology of the Assyrian monarchy, with remarks, 400 402—and of the Babylonian monarchy, 402—416—his account of the supposed site of Nineveh, 417, 418—observations on it, 418—421.

Dublin University, proceedings of, 274—279. 552.

Dynasties of the Egyptian kings, mentioned by Manetho, illustrations of, 159—161.

E.

Education in Ireland, account of the different societies for,—the Incorporated Society, 2—6; the Association for discountenancing Vice, 17—19; the Kildare-Street Institution, 20—System of education proposed by the Irish Education Commissioners, 21, 22—remarks

thereon, 22—25—importance of religious education to the poor, 97, 98.

Edward VI. and Queen Mary, poetical contrast between, 469, 470.

Egyptians. See *Hieroglyphics*.

Elmsley (Rev. Dr.) character of, 281, 282—particularly of his labours in classical literature, 282—rules followed by him in editing his Greek plays, *ib.* 283—notice of the different editions of Greek plays published by him, 283—the *Acharnenses* of Aristophanes, *ib.*—the *Œdipus Tyrannus* of Sophocles, 284—286—the *Heraclidæ* of Euripides, 284—the *Medea*, 285—*Bacchæ*, *ib.*—the *Œdipus Coloneus* of Sophocles, 286—remarks on Herman's review of his critical labours, 287, and of Dr. Elmsley's critical works, 288, 289—his opinion of Herman as a critic, 289, 290—account of his edition of the Roman Scholia upon Sophocles, 293—295—critical use which may be made of this edition, 296—299—passages of Sophocles which he proposed to correct, 319, 320.

Epigram on the Inquisition, 127.

Episcopacy, importance of, in India, 238.

Episcopal Church in Scotland, present state of, 375, 376.

Establishment (ecclesiastical) character of, 6, 7—its claims to support, 8.

Euripides, critical notice of Dr. Elmsley's editions of the *Heraclidæ*, *Medea*, and *Bacchæ* of, 284, 285.

Evangelist, duties of, 379.

F.

Farmer's (Mr.) treatise on miracles, error of, refuted, 62—68.

Fletcher, Lord Sondes *versus*, arguments in the case of, 495—534.

Forster's (Rev. Charles) successful refutation of Simon's interpretation of Gen. xx. 340—344—analysis of his critical Essay on Matt. ii. 17, 18, 344—347—remarks thereon, 347, 348.

Francis I., capture of, at the battle of Pavia, 388.

G.

Garbett (Rev. John) Vindication by, of Bishop Douglas, from the charge of false translation, 492, 493.

Gaselee (Mr. Justice) argument and opinion of, respecting the validity of special resignation bonds, 495—509.

Gaza, present state of, 373.

Geddes (Rev. Mr.) account of the Inquisition in Portugal, 120—was himself summoned before it, *ib.*

Grey (Sir Charles) tribute of, to Bishop Heber's character and labours, 239.

H.

Hale (Rev. W. H.) plan recommended by, for forming Diocesan Societies, for securing annuities to the widows of clergymen, 171—173—remarks thereon, 173, 174.

Heber (Rt. Rev. Reginald, Bishop of Calcutta) reflections on his nomination to India, 221, 222—sacrifices made by him, in accepting that appointment, 223—extracts from his farewell address to his parishioners, 223—225—from his sermon at the consecration of the church at Secrole, 227—229—his kindness to the Bishop of the Syrian Christians, 230—apostolical letter from him to the Bishop, 231—233—sketch of Dr. Heber's episcopal labours, 233, 234—notice of his death from the Calcutta Government Gazette, 234, 235—account of his conduct in India, by one of his chaplains, 236, 237—devotedness of the Bishop to his office, 238, 239—tribute to his memory by the Bishop of Chester, 495, 496.

Henry VIII. chivalrous pastimes of, 383—385—intrigues of the Constable Bourbon with him, 387—address of Anne Boleyn to him, 393—poetical character of, 468.

Herculeum, theory concerning the destruction of, 54—remarks thereon, *ib.* 55—57, and when the catastrophe happened, 58.

Herman (Professor) Dr. Elmsley's opinion of as a critic, 289, 290—his severe criticisms on Dr. Elmsley accounted for, 290—his just appreciation of Dr. Elmsley's character, *ib.*

Hieroglyphics (Egyptian) six propositions relating to, established by M. Champollion, 142—forms of the signs used by the Egyptians to express their ideas, 143—style in which they are executed, 144—number of hieroglyphic characters which are really different, and under what classes they may be distributed, 145—different kinds of symbols, *ib.* 146 why some phonetic hieroglyphics were used in preference to others, 148—passage from Clemens Alexandrinus, rela-

tive to the epistolographic, hieratic and hieroglyphic writing of the Egyptians, 149, 150—explanation of it, 150—use of the different kinds of hieroglyphics, 151—especially of the epistolographic or demotic, and hieratic, 152—obligations of M. Champollion to the previous hieroglyphic researches of Dr. Young, 153, 154—results of M. Champollion's labours, 155, 156—names of the Pharaohs, ascertained by him, 156—158—chronological data, illustrating certain dynasties of Egyptian kings mentioned by Manetho, 159—161.

Horne's (Rev. T. H.) Introduction to the Scriptures, order, &c. of, plagiarised, 102—109.

Hullock (Mr. Baron) argument and opinion of, respecting the validity of special resignation bonds, 509—531.

I.

Imagination, effects of too frequent appeals to, in the Church of Rome, 213, 214.

India, beneficial effects of episcopacy in, 238—240—memorial of the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge to the Directors of the East India Company, for augmenting the number of Bishops, 241—243—importance of the blending of religious persons and influence in India, 243—spiritual wants of India, 244—245.

Incorporated Society for promoting Education among the Irish Poor, design and institution of, 2, 3—charged with negligence, 4—the charge refuted, *ib.* 5—charged with cruelty, 5—the charge disproved, *ib.* 6—its masters vindicated from the charge of corruption, 6.

Inquisition in Spain, notice of early histories of, 119—122—124—126—sufferings of William Lithgow in, 122—of Isaac Martin, 123—of John Coustos, *ib.* epigram on the inquisitors, 127—qualifications of Señor Llorente, for writing his History of the Inquisition, 127, 128—atrocious cruelty practised in 1820, 129—crimes cognizable by this horrid tribunal, 120, 130—treatment of suspected Hebrew converts, 130—mode of proceeding of the Inquisition, 131, 132—anecdotes of remarkable victims of this tribunal, 133—the physician Torralva, *ib.* 134—Juan Perez de Saavedra, 135—Don Carlos, 136—139—Diaz, Bishop elect of Avila, 139—

- Donna Aquila, 140—suppression of the Inquisition by Buonaparte, *ib.*—revival of it by Ferdinand, *ib.*—number of victims sacrificed by the Inquisition, *ib.*
Instruction, remarks on the modern systems of, 179. See *Education, Mechanics' Institutes, London University.*
Ireland, account of the various societies in, for educating the poor, 2—the Incorporated Society, 2—6—the Association for discountenancing Vice, 17—19—the Kildare Street Institution, 20.
Italy, first peopled by the Celts and from the North-East, 33—38, and afterwards by the Pelasgi, 39—42—letters, when introduced, 44—Magna Græcia, when and by whom colonized, 49, 50—changes wrought in the climate of, 52, 53.

J.

- Jacob's dream*, remarks on, 227, 228.
Jerram (Rev. Charles) candid acknowledgment by, of his error, and change of sentiment on the subject of baptismal regeneration, 111—his view of scripture testimony on this subject, 112, 113—observations of, on repentance and faith, 114, 115—remarks thereon, 115—117, and on some of his statements respecting a peculiar style of preaching, 118.
Jerusalem, population of, 373.
Jolly (Rt. Rev. Bishop Alexander) observations of, on regeneration, 375.
Jortin (Dr.) observations of, on demoniacal possessions, 67, note.

K.

- Kildare Street* (Dublin) Institution, observations on, 20.

L.

- Latitudinarianism*, importance of guarding against, 24.
Lay-Baptism, Archbishop Sharpe's opinion of, 333.
Letters, knowledge of, when introduced into Italy, 44.
Life, pleasing illustration of, 223, 224.
Limborch's History of the Inquisition, character of, 121.
Lingard's (Dr.) *History of England*, character of, 380—his misrepresentation of the character of Anne Boleyn, 393.

Lippi (Signor) theory of, respecting the destruction of Pompeii and Herculæum, 54.

Lithgow (William) sufferings of, in the Inquisition, 122.

Llorente (Señor) qualifications of, for writing a history of the Inquisition, 127, 128—his account of the treatment of Jews, who were secretly Christians, 130—of the adventures of the physician Torralva, 133, 134.

London (Rt. Rev. Wm. Lord Bishop of) admirable observations by, on the revival and present state of the Roman Catholic controversy, 163—166—on the duties of the clergy, 167—the proper manner of performing the occasional offices, 168—the Bishop unjustly arraigned as the enemy of education, 169—recommendation of charitable institutions, immediately in connexion with the Church of England, *ib.*—on the favourable prospects of the Church, 170.

London University, account of projects of instruction which preceded it, 188, 189—its institution, 190—remarks on its defects, *ib.*—particularly the total exclusion of religion, 191—194—examination of the assertion that the sciences may be taught equally well, without reference to theology, 195—197—examination of the course proposed in the London University, 198, 199—evil of separating religion from human knowledge, 200, 201—absence of intellectual or moral discipline, 202, 203—little to be expected from it, 204.

Lord Mayor's visit to Oxford, account of, 475—480.

Low (Rt. Rev. Bp. David) observations of, on the Episcopal Church in Scotland, 375, 376—his complaint of intrusive clergymen from England, 377.

Lowe (Rev. T. H.) remarks of, on Dr. Milner's garbling of passages cited by him from the Fathers, 490, 491.

Lux Renata, extracts from, 468—471, 472—character of Henry VIII. *ib.*—contrast between Edward VI. and Mary, 469, 470—character of his style, 473.

M.

Magna Græcia, when and by whom peopled, 49, 50—paucity of architectural remains there, 51.

Mahometans, objections of, to the evidence of miracles, 79—on what ground they satisfy themselves of the pretensions of

- Mahommed**, 80—their notions about magic, 81, 82—suggestion as to the best mode of contending with, 83.
- Manetho's** dynasties of certain Egyptian kings, illustrations of, 129—161.
- Manuscripts** of Sophocles, account of the most ancient, in various parts of Europe, 301—305.
- Martin** (Isaac) sufferings of, in the Inquisition, 123.
- Mary I.** and Edward VI., poetical contrast between, 469, 470.
- Mechanics' Institutes**, advantages of, 179—evils attendant on them, 180—account of the rise, progress, and tendency of the Mechanics' Institute of the metropolis, 181—184—remarks on the exclusion of morality and theology from its course of instruction, 184.
- Merewether** (Rev. Francis) address of, to his parishioners, on dissent, 216.
- Middleton** (Bishop) tribute to the memory of, 495.
- Miller** (Rev. Dr.) observations of, on the history of the plea of tradition, made by the Romish Church, 93, 94.
- Milman** (Rev. H. H.) observations of, on the effects of too frequent appeals to the imagination in the Church of Rome, 213, 214—and on the requisites of a sermon, 214, 215.
- Milner** (Dr. John) character of his 'End of Religious Controversy,' 489—convicted of garbling quotations from the Fathers, 490, 491—refutation of his charge against Bishop Douglas, of falsely translating one of his authorities, 492, 493.
- Miracles**, error of Mr. Farmer's treatise on, examined and refuted, 62—69—preliminary principles laid down by Mr. Penrose, 69—examination of a supposed case of similar miracles, wrought by persons of opposite pretensions, 70, 71—refutation of the charge that Christians produce doctrines in proof of miracles, 72, 73—the propriety of miracles as a credential of a divine teacher, 74—character of the scripture witnesses for miracles, 86—and of the miracles wrought by Moses and Jesus Christ, 87—observations on the miraculous frustration of Julian's attempt to rebuild the Jewish temple, 87, 88—strength of evidence of scripture miracles, 89, 90—remarks on the claims upon our attention, of alleged miracles not recorded in scripture, 100, 101.
- Missionary**, difficulties of, in contending with Mahometans, 79—82.
- Monk** (Very Rev. Dean) appeal of, in behalf of the clergy, 217, 218.
- Moses**, facts recorded by, how preserved by tradition, 445, 446.

N.

Nineveh, observations on the site of, 417—422.

Nolan (Rev. Frederick) analysis of his work on the Assyrian expectations of a deliverer, 444—state of the question before his work appeared, 446—abstract of his statement that the Sethites are the same as the Sabæans, 447, 448 remarks thereon, 448, 449—and on his opinion that the prophecy of Enoch was known to the Sabæans, 449, 450—his account of Balaam, 451, 452—his translation of Balaam's prophecy, 452—remarks thereon, 453—460—and on his etymology and interpretation of the word Nebo, 460—463.

O.

Omnipresence of the Deity, reflections on, 229.

Oxford University, proceedings of, 264—268, 544—547—number of its members, 268.

P.

Pæstum, silence of ancient writers concerning, 51—total demolition of, *ib.* 52—observations on the celebrated roses of Pæstum, 52, 53.

Patteson (Rev. Edw.) extracts from the sermons of, on self-examination, 359, 360—on the limits of conformity, 360, 361.

Pavia, battle of, 388.

Pelasgi, reasons for concluding that Italy was peopled by, subsequently to the Celts, 39—42—notice of their settlements, 42, 43.

Pendulum, death inflicted by, in the Inquisition, 129.

Penrose (Rev. John) principles established by, for conducting an inquirer through the difficulties incident to many cases of miraculous attestation, 69—illustration of them, 70, 71—remarks of, on the hold which scripture miracles take on the mind, from the probability of its doctrines, 75—on the proper criterion of scripture miracles, 76, 77—on

the character of the witnesses for the scripture miracles, 86, 87—on Julian's attempt to rebuild the temple of Jerusalem, 87, 88—commendation of his treatise on miracles, 92.

Petrifactions in Egypt, notice of, 369, 370.

Pharaohs, names of, ascertained by M. Champollion, 156—158.

Piazza's (H. B.) account of the Inquisition, character of, 125—anecdote related by him, *ib.* 126.

Pole (Cardinal) proofs of the treasons committed by, 397, 398—his testimony entitled to little credit, 391, 392.

Pompeii, theory concerning the destruction of, 54—remarks thereon, 55—57—when the catastrophe took place, 58.

Population of Cairo, 370—of Jerusalem, 375.

Psalms, importance of, 430, 431—remarks on the manner in which it is performed in some churches, 431, 432.

Publications (foreign theological) list of, 279, 280.

R.

Regeneration (baptismal) doctrine of scripture on, 112, 113.

Religion, remarks on the exclusion of from the course of study in the new London University, 191—199—evils of separating religion from human knowledge, 200, 201.

Repentance and Faith, observations on, 114—117.

Robinson (Rev. Thomas) extracts from the funeral sermon of, on Bishop Heber, 235—237.

Roman Catholic controversy, observations on the revival and present state of, 163—166—little authority to be attached to the unauthorized declarations of some Roman Catholics, disclaiming opinions charged upon them as a body, 487, 488.

Rome, remarks on the uncertainty of the early history of, 45—scepticism of some modern historians considered, 46—source of its early history, 47—silence of early Greek writers concerning, 48, 49.

Romish Church, origin and progress of her plea of tradition, 93, 94—effects produced in, by too frequent appeals to the imagination, 213, 214.

Rose (Rev. H. J.) opinion of, concerning the tendency of the prevalent opinions about knowledge, how far supported by facts, 177, 178—superiority of moral science to physical, 203—in what re-

spects he has pushed his sentiments too far, 206—210.

Roses of Pæstum, notice of, 52.

Ruins, ancient, notices of, between Abusir and Agaba, 366—of Parætonium, 367—of the temple of Jupiter Ammon, 368, 369.

Rural Deans, importance of, 427.

S.

Saavedra (Juan Perez) adventures of, 135. *St. David's College*, notice of, 273. 552.

Sarpi's (Paolo) History of the Inquisition, character of, 121.

Sermon, requisites of, 214, 215—extracts from Bishop Heber's farewell sermon, 223—225—from his sermon on the omnipresence of the Deity, 227—229.

Scholz (Dr.) outline of the biblical travels of, 362, 363—his observations on the indiscreet liberality of some Englishmen, 364—on the natural history of the countries visited by him, 365—on the manners of the Bedouins, 365—367, 368—ruins between Abusir and Agaba, 366—ancient inscription near Sterrir, *ib.*—ruins of the ancient Parætonium, 367—on the ruins of the temple of Jupiter Ammon, 368, 369—traffic of the modern inhabitants of Siwa, 369—account of some petrifications, 369, 370—population of Cairo, 370—present state of the Copts, *ib.*—371—literary institution of the Dare 'l hakmet, at Cairo, 371—caves on Mount Carmel, 372—present state of Gaza, *ib.*—373—population of Jerusalem, 373.

Scotland, present state of the Episcopal Church in, 375, 376—intrusion of some English clergymen in, 377.

Self-examination, duty of, 359, 360.

Shakspeare, reading of, recommended by Archbishop Sharpe, 323.

Sharpe (Dr. John, Archbishop. of York) birth and education of, 321, 322—is ordained, 323—his marriage, *ib.*—character, as rector of St. Giles's, 324—care, in composing his sermons, *ib.*—appointed Dean of Norwich, 325—remarks on the address, drawn up by him for the Grand Jury of the city of London, 325—appointed Dean of Canterbury, 326—raised to the see of York, *ib.*—his impartiality in bestowing prebends, 327—his opinion of the societies for reformation of manners, 329, 330—noble and disinterested conduct in public life, 330, 331—share in promoting

the grant of Queen Anne's bounty, 332—his opinion of the Church of England, *ib.*—on lay-baptism, 333—generous interference in behalf of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, 334—also of the Vaudois, *ib.*—simplicity of his private character, 335—conversational talents, *ib.*—charity, 336—retired devotion, 337—his death, 338.

Simon's (Father) interpretation of Gen. xx. refuted, 340—344.

Siwa, notice of the modern inhabitants of 369.

Sondes (Lord) v. Fletcher, arguments and opinions in the case of, 495—534.

Sophocles, account of the Roman Scholia upon, 291, 292—and of Dr. Elmsley's edition of them, 293—295—examples of the use which may be made of his edition, 296—299—critical notice of his editions of the *Œdipus Tyrannus*, 284—286—of the *Œdipus Coloneus*, 286—of the Oxford edition of *Sophocles*, 299, 300—318—account of the most ancient manuscripts of *Sophocles*, at Florence, 301, 302—at Rome, 302, 303—at Naples and Paris, 303—in England, 304—in Germany, *ib.*—at Moscow, 305—classification of the editions of *Sophocles*, 306—318—passages of *Sophocles*, which Dr. Elmsley proposed to correct, 319, 320.

Symbols, different kinds of, used by the Egyptians, 149, 150.

Syriac Christians of St. Thomas, at Travancore, notice of, 230—hospitable reception, by Bishop Heber, of their bishop, Mar Athanasius, 231—apostolical letter of Bishop Heber to him, *ib.*—232.

T. 23-7

Texts illustrated:

Gen. xviii. 18,	455, 456.
— xviii. 21, 22,	456.
— xx.	340—344.
— xxxv. 16—19,	345.
— xlix. 10.	462.
Exod. xxiv. 4,	456.
Numb. xxiv. 17, 453, 454.	457—459.
Josh. iv. 5, xxiv. 6,	456.
Isa. xlv. 1,	460, 461.
Jer. xxxi. 16—19.	345.
Matt. ii. 16, 17,	345, 347.

Tiberias, notice of, 373.

Torralva (Dr. Eugene) adventures of, in the Inquisition, 133, 134.

Tradition, origin and progress of the plea of, set up by the Romish Church, 93.

Turner (Sharon) plan of, in his History of Henry VIII. 380, 381—remarks on it, 381, 382—his account of the chivalrous pastimes of that king, 383—385—on the intrigues of the constable Bourbon, 387—account of the battle of Pavia, and the capture of Francis, King of France, 388, 389—remarks on the testimony of Cardinal Pole, 391, 392—his treasons, 397, 398—anecdote of Anne Boleyn, 393—nature of the charges against her, 394—summary of the evidence for and against her, 395, 396—strictures on Mr. Turner's panegyric of Henry VIII. 398.

Tuscans, decline of the ancient power of, 45.

Tyrrheni, progress of, in Italy, 42, 43.

U.

Universities, proceedings of:—Oxford, 264—263. 544—547—Cambridge, 269—273. 548—551—St. David's College, Cardiganshire, 273, 552—University of Dublin, 274—279.—See *London University*.

V.

Vaughan (Rev. Edward) analysis of his sermon on the rights of Cæsar and God, 350—specimens of his biblical criticisms, 351—curious extracts from his sermon, on rendering unto Cæsar, 351—353—on rendering to God, 354—and on the connexion between rendering to Cæsar and to God, 355—356 specimen of his sublimity, 356, 357.

Volcanic eruption that destroyed Herculænum, examination of, 54—57—date of the catastrophe, 58—traditionary account of the volcanic eruptions of Vesuvius, 59.

W.

Westminster School, notice of examination at, 552.

Widows of Clergymen, plan of Diocesan Societies for securing Annuities to, 171—173—remarks thereon, 173, 174.

Wolsey (Cardinal) character of 385, 386.

Y.

Young (Dr.) obligations of M. Champollion to the hieroglyphic discoveries of, 153, 154.

322773

P
LE

B

Author

Title British critic, ser.4. 1, 1827

**University of Toronto
Library**

**DO NOT
REMOVE
THE
CARD
FROM
THIS
POCKET**

**Acme Library Card Pocket
LOWE-MARTIN CO. LIMITED**

